THEY MUST

or

God and The Social Democracy

ornia
al
y

THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES

THEY MUST

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/theymustorgodsoc00kutt

HERMANN KUTTER

THEY MUST;

OR

GOD AND THE SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

A FRANK WORD TO CHRISTIAN MEN AND WOMEN

BY

HERMANN KUTTER

MINISTER AT THE NEW MINSTER IN ZURICH

AMERICAN EDITOR

RUFUS W. WEEKS

PUBLISHED BY THE

CO-OPERATIVE PRINTING COMPANY

CHICAGO

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Copyright, 1908

by the

CO-OPERATIVE PRINTING COMPANY

CHICAGO

All Rights Reserved

CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
	Preface by the American Editor	7
	Author's Address to American Readers	15
I.	How the Bible Speaks of God	24
II.	The Social Democracy and Atheism	31
III.	The Social Democracy and Christianity	65
IV.	The Social Democracy and Revolution	107
V.	The Social Democracy and Sin	135
VI.	The Social Democracy and Materialism	155
VII.	The Social Democracy and Morality	175
VIII.	The Social Democracy and Patriotism	203
IX.	All Things Must Become New	211

APPENDIX

	The List of Sustainers	217
	The Best Things to Read	227

1491058

PREFACE BY THE AMERICAN EDITOR

The economic life of man, the political life of man, the religious life of man—these three are the main lines which make up the unceasing march of the human race called history; and it is the form and character of these three activities, primarily of the economic, secondarily of the political and religious, which determine the varying degrees of welfare or misery that are the lot of the human race, generation by generation.

As, from the vantage ground of our own generation, we look back and then with ardent desire peer forward, everyone who has a mind hopeful and unshackled, feels sure of so much as this: that the human race will in time find the law of harmony for its economic life, the law of harmony for its political life, the law of harmony for its religious life, and will subject itself fully to these laws. This means that instead of the discord and cross purposes which now rule industry and business and which have always ruled them, will finally come the fullness of co-operation; when there shall be no more tug of war, but all shall be pulling to one end. It means also a like stable reconciliation of elements now struggling in the field of statecraft, and it means a similar peace in the domain of religion.

It will then be as if the human race, after weary and woeful centuries of climbing, with times, alas, of retrogression, had at last emerged upon the level desired so

long—a plateau where the march will go forward through many happy centuries. When the edge of that plateau has been really overpast, and when, as Monod has well said, the true human life begins, all the thoughtful of that generation will pause and they will look back and down the way the race has climbed. They will study the various movements and parties of the latest centuries; and they may find that the sole movement which in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries had clearly avowed and passionately sought that universal co-operation which actually became the state attained by the race, was itself a compelling factor in the process of attainment. They may find, that is, that the Socialism of our day was the sharpest and most effective agency in bringing in the solution, the final commonwealth.

And when they consider the religious phase, and if it shall be that the all-embracing religion is identical with a purified socially-ethical Christianity, they may find that the most pronounced form of such a Christianity in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries was an ally needed by Socialism, and vitally serving Socialism. These are surely both likely guesses; and if they are true guesses, then it follows with certainty that the thoughtful of that soberly happy generation will recognize as a most weighty event of these years now passing, the discovery now passionately hailed, and with widening acceptance, that the Kingdom of God proclaimed by Jesus and the Co-operative Commonwealth foreseen and willed by the Socialists, are one and the same. The pioneers of this Great Identification will then stand out as the true leaders of men, however

little the mass may now perceive them to be their leaders.

The early discoverers of the identification, whether in France or England or this country, went no further than to identify two abstractions, two pictures of the future; they expressly disowned the actual Socialists of the Continent, rebuked their atheism and bitterness, and proposed to the Christian world a rival program, named "Christian Socialism," and to their mind altogether lovely and of good report. Such an identification was courageous, but not thorough; and it could not be ultimately satisfactory to the German mind, whose very stamp is "thorough"; the German mind was sure sooner or later to see deeper, to see through the contradictions of the Social Democracy to Christianity. It has done so and has proclaimed the essential oneness of the actual Socialist movement of the nineteenth century with that movement which Jesus meant to found. Not that so wonderful an act of insight was shared by any considerable number of observers among German Christians; it required a heroic quality both of mind and of heart such as there are few instances of in any generation. The first open and widely published proclamation of this identification was the book, "They Must, a Frank Word to Christian Men and Women," now offered to American readers. Its author, Hermann Kutter, is of the German race, a Swiss pastor, 45 years of age, an orthodox member of the Protestant Church. Until the year 1898 he was pastor of a small church near Berne; in that year he was elected by the people of one of the districts of Zurich to be minister of their church. Zurich is a

place of great intellectual and social activity, where the proletariat is especially strong. Kutter, who had already studied the social question with ardor, was here soon convinced of the inherent opposition of official Christianity to the requirements of the Gospel. After many internal struggles, and against opposition, he was led to judge and declare that the Church, which God has entrusted with the highest duty to mankind, had, through faithlessness and worldliness, failed in her duty to make valid the Gospel of the living God. The Gospel is not only a means of salvation for the future life, but it is the message of the Kingdom of God for whose coming Jesus taught us to pray. God knows no distinction between internal and external questions—questions of piety and questions of economics; but from His spiritual treasury go forth His world-subduing forces, like those of a tree, which grows from the inside to the outside, and to these forces all conditions must submit. God is a God of progress, and brings His Kingdom to realization, not only through those who acknowledge Him, but also through those who, holding aloof from all relation to the Church, keep their hearts open to truth. Such thoughts as these, boldly uttered forth by Kutter from his pulpit, aroused great attention. Those who had first elected him for the most part deserted him, but in their place great numbers who had never cared for the Church, especially the mass of the "lower classes," flocked about him. It appears that a minister in Switzerland is, in a sense, a state official, being elected for a term of six years by the citizens of the district where the church is situated. In 1904, when Kutter

stood for a second election, the orthodox voted against him, their own co-religionist, who still remained frankly orthodox; whereas Atheists and unbelievers, Democrats and Socialists gave him their votes to an overwhelming majority.

Religiously and theologically Kutter is orthodox—a theist of the theists—a Christian of the Christians. It is his very ardent devotion to the church which makes him her unsparing critic—he wants to see the temple cleansed because he loves the temple so well. "Faithful are the wounds of a friend," and such are those he inflicts upon the church; he is a surgeon with a lancet, not a foe with a rapier.

In these modern days of enlightenment such criticism of the church offered from within, and by men who abhor schism and heresy, is hospitably received in the church itself, and is recognized as wholesome even by many who would qualify its terms. The case has to be stated strongly, to be taken in at all; but the extreme statements do not offend, since the loyal spirit back of them is felt.

It was necessary that Kutter should point out the failure of those German Christians who went into the *"christlich-sozial"* movement to grasp the true meaning of the Social Democracy which they antagonized. It is also necessary here in America that the anti-Socialist social reformers should be shown in the true light, as hinderers, unwitting though they may be, of the real movement of Divine Providence in the masses to-day. The Social Democracy in Germany is not an atheist party; there as here religious belief is proclaimed by the highest assembly of the party to be the affair of

each man for himself. Still it is true that many German Socialists, many of the most representative, avow themselves atheists; and this is what furnishes the anti-Socialist Christians of Germany their ground for condemning the Social Democracy. Kutter's marvelous insight sees, and his powerful speech shows, that this atheism is but skin-deep; that it is only of the formal intellect, not of the spirit; that indeed the spirit of the Social Democracy is of that fiery fidelity and certainty which are the substance of faith in God; furthermore, that the real atheism, the atheism of the spirit, is on the other side, among the faithless Christians who do not recognize the hand of the Ancient of Days in the movement which embodies His will to-day. And even this practical atheism in the Church Kutter points out only to the end that the Church may see it herself, and judge herself of it, and stand forth glorious once more as the defender of human welfare and progress.

Reading the pages of *"They Must,"* there comes out a picture of the Social Democracy as our author sees it, a picture drawn in Kutter's vivid way—a dash here and a dash there. This picture may be a little heightened by adding a touch or two to bring out the definite good things already achieved by the Social Democratic movement in Germany; for its benefits to the working class are not all in the future, some have already been realized. There is first the mental and spiritual uplift of the association itself; the expansion of the soul which comes from feeling oneself a part of a grand world-movement; the immense enlarging of the mind's horizon; the perpetual interest in wide affairs which active membership in the party excites and

keeps alive. Then there is the powerful impetus which the Social Democratic movement has given and is giving to the trade union and co-operative movements in Germany. The comradeship and discipline which working men find in the party predispose them to close and abiding fellowship in those other lines of activity which, through faithful united effort, become so profitable. Furthermore, and more substantial and measurable perhaps, there is the effect of the Social Democratic party on legislation. Germany is far in advance of the other countries in its social laws, and this is due to two causes—the early and powerful development of the Social Democratic party, and the genius of Bismarck which saw that something substantial must be done by the government for the working class, that some effort must be made to steal the Socialist thunder. The system of compulsory insurance established by Bismarck in 1881 was a great and beneficial innovation; it has furthermore been since improved from time to time, in several points, on the initiative of the Social Democratic members of the Reichstag. This system covers all the wage-earners in the Empire, making provision for those who become disabled through sickness, accident or old age, and also for the widows and orphans of workingmen dying. The provision is of course not adequate, but it is vastly better than anything yet established in other countries; and it never would have been thought of but for the Social Democracy.

"They Must" has been translated into Dutch and into French, and has been published in those languages. In editing the present English text, I have had the

benefit of comparing with the manuscript of an independent translation made by Mr. Richard Heath of England, kindly lent by him. There is something peculiarly noble and inspiring in the Socialist cause in that it gives birth to a true cosmopolitan union, in which comrades clasp hands with comrades around the world with perfect indifference to race, nationality, or language; and this book is put forth here in the hope that it will help to deepen and widen this current of united life among the peoples.

RUFUS W. WEEKS.

New York, June, 1908.

AUTHOR'S ADDRESS TO AMERICAN READERS

To American readers of "They Must," who may not be familiar with recent socio-political history in Germany, and to whom therefore the earlier pages of my work may be obscure, I offer the following explanations:

The Christian Socialist movement in America is an entirely different thing from what is called the Christian Social movement in the Germanic countries; and it is from the latter that my book takes its starting point. In America at the present time a Christian Socialist movement is arising, almost entirely as a result of two causes: on the one hand, an enormous capitalism, concentrated in a few holdings of staggering amount, the perniciousness of which is apparent to all; and, on the other hand, a young and energetic Christianity, able to act on its own impulses, not controlled either by state or by society. This Christian Socialist movement seems parallel with the political Socialist movement, and fairly in unison with it, since what is common to the two is much more important and much more prized by the adherents of the two than any differences.

In Germany the case is quite different. When Socialism first came to the fore, capitalism was still in its earlier stage, the process of concentration was hardly begun; and, on the other hand, Christianity, being the state religion, was so fettered and bound that

it could not get its mind at all clear upon its original essence,—its original revolutionary hostility to the spirit of the world. Thus we had a weak capitalism and a weak Christianity; but, over against them, a strong Social Democracy, holding fast to a philosophic doctrinairism which the giant mind of Marx had carried to an extreme height. This doctrinairism gave the whole Socialist movement from the start an impulse towards the field of theory—and, in the field of theory, propositions put forth challenge, naturally and inevitably, the putting forth of denials.

It must not be forgotten that the German mind has a certain fondness for emphasizing contrasts of idea, for building up parties on such contrasts, and so for giving to abstractions too much weight, to the injury of the concrete affair in hand. It will therefore seem not unnatural that the Evangelical Social movement in Germany asserted itself from the beginning as the opponent of the Social Democracy—even claimed such opposition as its chief reason for being. The comprehensionist view-point, which is able even to embrace the irreligious Social Democracy in the cause of the urgent postulates common to the two—such a view-point as can be taken now-a-days and is exemplified in my book—such a view-point as in America was natural from the beginning—was unthinkable by the founders of the German Christian Social movement.

These leaders placed their movement at the outset in deliberate opposition to the Social Democracy; and, although this is easily comprehensible under the conditions above explained, it was nevertheless a sad and fatal error; it took away from Christianity its quality

of comprehensiveness, and degraded it to the stock-in-trade of a faction. I will touch briefly on these transactions, referring particularly to two men who are repeatedly mentioned in my book—Stoecker and Naumann—and leaving out of view others who, like Nathusius, played no considerable part.

The idea of a socially active Christianity, a Christianity aimed at conditions as well as at hearts, had long been discussed and vigorously maintained by Wichern, the father of city missions, and by other men inspired and aroused by the Gospel; but it was Court Chaplain Adolf Stoecker who first gave solid form to such an idea. He did this by calling into life—after a memorable discussion with the leaders of the Social Democracy in the "Eiskeller" in Berlin—a Christian Labor Party. But the expected working-class contingent stayed outside, and it shortly became manifest that the newly formed party was little else than a middle-class faction, without real conscious aim or program. Ultimately it allowed itself to be taken in tow by the principal Conservative Party, ceasing to be a labor party in any real sense; then it no longer called itself the Christian Social Labor Party, but merely the Christian Social Party. It lost all influence with the masses of the working class, and finally from the year 1890, merged into the Evangelical Social Congress, which, though often bringing out excellent productions among its papers, has never resulted in any action worth mention on behalf of the suffering masses.

Besides the groups organized by Stoecker, there had been an independent development of other groups of Christian laborers called Evangelical Labor Associa-

tions; these associations, however, pursued from the start only religious and educational aims. From these groups graduated that man who, next to Stoecker, was to exert the greatest influence on the Christian Social movement of Germany—Frederick Naumann. This man took up Stoecker's original policy with enthusiasm, as Stoecker himself moved away from it; and, when it appeared that the Evangelical Labor associations were in danger of being absorbed by the Stoecker movement, then become entirely conservative, Naumann led many of the associations to cut loose and adopt a new program under the name of National Social. This program was designed expressly to meet the needs of the laborers, and was meant to serve as the standard for a new social movement. These associations, thanks to the brilliant leadership of Naumann, were very flourishing at the outset; but they did not fulfil that early promise. Naumann allowed himself more and more to be driven over into the camp of political liberalism; until, as a liberal, he is to-day actually found approving of the "embarrassment" policy—equally unworthy and impossible—of Chancellor von Buelow, who has formed a coalition of the Conservatives and the Liberals against the Catholics and the Social Democrats. Naumann has also come to be a champion of the world-power policy of the German government, and has given up in despair the winning for Christianity of any other than strictly moral and religious tasks. The Stoecker party and the Naumann party are now out of the game: whatever shape or name they take, "Christian Social," "Evangelical So-

cial," or "National Social," they spell to-day lifeless entities.

How came this about? In my view, as suggested above, from the error that both Stoecker and Naumann made in emphasizing the antithesis of their movement to the Social Democracy, at the expense of what was in common. Their chief purpose in founding their several Christian labor parties was to check the rapid growth of the Social Democracy; and, therefore, even if they placed social aims in the foreground, still those aims could not obtain a clear and definite expression, or impress themselves as of weighty import. The Evangelical Socials never perceived that the oneness of the social needs and tasks of the working class is fatal to any cleavage on religious or national lines. Wrapped up in their religious prejudices, and alarmed by the radicalism of the leaders of the Social Democracy, they did not recognize the providential importance of that rising movement; and they never saw deep enough to discover the elementary truth that the Social Democracy, in spite of all its one-sidedness, is, in its essentials, simply right. They did not permit themselves to be enough penetrated by the great notion of Justice, as a ray emanating from the very life of God, not concerned about religious tenets and dogmas; uniting all its devotees, however they may differ in theories, in the cause of the one deed; and, for the sake of the great common good, burying the differences bequeathed by a moribund civilization under the living demands of justice.

In opposition to all this, it was my idea in "*They Must*" to place in relief the divine justification of the

Social Democracy. On the surface the book may seem little else than a panegyric of the Social Democracy as a political party, but at bottom it is something else than that. My interest was not in the Social Democratic party; in fact I do not myself belong to that party;* my interest was in the great idea of social justice which is proclaimed by the Gospel and which I saw more clearly expressed through even the errors of that party than through the vague programs of the Christian Social movement. I spoke for the Social Democracy because the others had spoken against it; without concealing from myself what is clearly expressed in the book—how far even the Social Democracy is from attaining the great ideal which it has set itself.

But all this is beside the real matter. At bottom the question is not of dogma, whether Social Democratic or Christian; not of fixed tenets of world philosophy; not of party maxims and symbols; but of the fact that the living God Himself is manifesting His Kingdom in the social movement which is to-day permeating the whole world, and which finds its most imposing expression in the German Social Democracy; and that thus it is God Himself who is carrying the Gospel of His Son to victory throughout all the old structures of civilization.

To set forth this truth I wrote "They Must." An auxiliary inducement was the fact that here in Switzerland the idea that the social question is of the utmost consequence, and that the Gospel of Jesus itself justi-

*Dr. Kutter votes the Social Democratic ticket, but does not belong to a Socialist local—a distinction clear only to those who understand Socialist methods.

ñes such a revolution of our present economic system as will establish a just distribution of the products of labor, is spreading among ministers of the Gospel as well as in wider circles. A new group is forming among us, calling itself neither Christian Social nor Evangelical Social, but "Religious Social"—a name meant to show that this new group knows how to unite the radicalism of the Social Democratic belief with a warm and enthusiastic religious devotion. It is coming to be better and better understood among us that old watchwords—such as, conservative, radical, orthodox, liberal—have lost their meaning. A new spirit, the spirit of truth and life, permeates and unites the hearts of men and women, who heretofore have called themselves by differing names. It is beginning to be understood that true Christianity is not hostile to any movement which serves the well-being of mankind; that, on the contrary, by virtue of its inclusiveness, its being God's own life in the hearts of men, it has power to turn everything for the best—even such elements as the atheism and materialism of the Social Democracy, which seem to be exact opposites to the Gospel. The Spirit of God, whose express purpose is to bring creation, corrupted by sin, back under the sway of justice and love, makes us glad and strong, so that we, for the sake of the great common goal, are able without hesitation to walk hand in hand with the Social Democracy.

In America conditions are much more favorable to such a movement, since the Social Democracy there has devoted itself more to questions of action and less to mere abstract antitheses; and we rejoice that with you

there already flourishes a Christian Socialist movement corresponding so closely with that which is now making its way with us upon the clear showing that the earlier attempts of a Stoecker and a Naumann, well-meant as they were, had to fail and that the only vital Social Christianity is that which can take up into its own proclamation the radical economic postulates of the Social Democracy. Only such a Social Christianity as this can win back that reverence of men to the Gospel, which has been lost through the hostile or indifferent stand taken by Christian churches and parties toward the social question.

It is my earnest hope that my book may help somewhat in breaking the way in America, hand in hand with the excellent propaganda of the Christian Socialist Fellowship, for the original Gospel of the Kingdom of God. God bless our American co-workers! God bless America!

HERMANN KUTTER.

Zurich, Switzerland, May, 1908.

THEY MUST

CHAPTER I.

HOW THE BIBLE SPEAKS OF GOD.

Some time ago the author had a conversation with a friend on the subject of God. After we had discussed the usual doubts and riddles, she made the following remarkable statement: "It is clear to me that God exists, but for all that so many things are dark that I can never find peace of mind." My readers will probably find nothing strange in this statement, as no doubt many of them have often expressed themselves in the same way. Nevertheless the statement is a strange one, as we shall see if we appeal to the classic document of our faith, the Bible. Christians do appeal to the Bible. What then does it say of God?

Let no one fear that I am going to lose myself here in the manifold intricacies of this question, or that I am concerned to write anything like an exhaustive biblical theology. The Bible itself forbids any such thing. The Bible is simple in its doctrine of God; it presupposes His existence without more ado. To be sure, it speaks of Him in the most manifold ways; now describing Him in His exalted being, now celebrating His power through the praise of His glorious works. There is in its language the fullest expression of every phase of our relation to Him; the exaltation in the thought of His glory, the longing for His pres-

ence, the joy in His possession, and the anguish of the consciousness of His absence. Systems of philosophy may be evolved from its pages as easily as the commonest spiritual truths of experience. Not only all theologies, but even all philosophies have claimed to find their justification in the Bible, and still make that claim. Each philosophical or theological party affirms on the authority of the Bible the doctrinal points which its opponent rejects on the same authority. All of these claim to understand the Bible, but none of them do understand it.

The Bible is not understood because its great simplicity is not understood. Men think that they are bound to hunt everywhere for hidden meanings in it and to bring them to the light, while they constantly overlook its simple purpose. These hidden meanings are really in the imagination of the reader and not in the simple truth of the Bible. And yet that simple truth of the Bible lies so close at hand that all eyes may see it. Wherein does it lie? Simply in this, that the Bible says: "God lives." Is that then so ordinary, so self-evident a thing? Yes, so ordinary that nobody has yet grasped it; so self-evident that great and small alike have stumbled over it as over a heavy stone in the way. The Bible and we start from opposite points. We, in our efforts, our morality, our religion, move laboriously toward God; the Bible starts with God. We set God at the end of a more or less complicated thought process; the Bible unfolds its ideas from his existence. For us there are all sorts of realities besides God, often very unlovely ones; for the Bible there is only one reality that matters—God.

We are uncertain, changing, vacillating between trust and doubt. The Bible knows only of trust, of that which abides and is because it is. The Bible is diametrically opposed to our Christianity. Where it says Yes, we say No; and where it denies, we cringe and whisper Yes.

A tremendous fact! Let us come nearer to its meaning.

Considering the New Testament only, we find that every page reveals this contrast between then and now. That which Christianity has said and done is not to be reconciled with what Jesus said and did. "He spoke with authority and not as the scribes." The people were astounded at his teaching. His greatness did not consist in the fact that he added a new attainment, even the most wonderful, to what others had done before him. He did not develop or complete; he set an entirely new view of life over against the old.

Men have lingered too long over his casual words and imparted a dogmatic meaning to them; the old error of human thought "making systems out of words" has been especially baneful here. We should not tarry over his single utterances; but should first of all seek to grasp his personality in its wholeness. His sayings on particular occasions are as often determined by the casual environment as by the main intent of his spirit, and may, therefore, be neither new nor striking. If we wish to know what he really was we must take such words as : "I do not mine own works but the works of the Father who sent me." Or again the first words of his ministry: "The Kingdom of God is at hand." In such sayings as these lies the interpretation

of all the rest. Jesus did not lay down any religious or ethical postulate as the ground-thought of his mission. He simply maintained that what he did was the work of the Father, and that he and the Father were one. What we have in the person of Jesus before our eyes is the experiencing of the Father.

This experience appears to us so simple and self-evident only because we are no longer able to imagine it, to say nothing of appropriating it. We have buried that truth under the dogmas, ceremonies and creeds of the cumulative centuries. So even in our most earnest moments of piety we are doing our own works and not the works of God. Our very religion hinders us from seeing that there is a living God. Our religion furnishes us with the material for a complicated system of opinions, called beliefs, but we have lost all comprehension of the endless life that springs from religion. In a word, the deep-seated difference between us and Jesus lies in the simple fact that he had God and we have not. And all the minor details of contrast between us and Jesus, and which the opponents of Christianity can so readily enumerate, have their cause here. With Jesus was the living God; with us is only the idea of a God.

Why did Jesus speak the wonderful words of the Sermon on the Mount? Because he had the Father. Why do we fail to understand them? Because we have not the Father. Or perhaps we think that we do understand them. If so, what does "poor in spirit" mean? Can these words be understood by men who have all sorts of goods besides God? Is not the poverty of spirit which Jesus speaks of the lack of all things but God?

Does our Christianity understand anything of that? Or what is the significance for our modern Christianity, of the words, "Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness?" Are the many churches and chapels that we are so lavishly building a sign of hunger for righteousness? Are the theological controversies between the parties of Christendom a sign of thirst after righteousness? Or again, "Happy are ye when men shall revile you for my sake." Do our pastors and preachers, our ecclesiastics, from the pope down to the humblest village minister, give the impression of people persecuted for Jesus' sake? They may despise and persecute, but they know not how to be despised themselves. Why? Because they have not the living God. The despised of all people to-day are the Social Democrats. I am tempted to believe that *there* is to-day's revelation of God.

Where among Christians is the saying "Love your enemies" understood? Who heeds the mandate, "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth"? or "Take no thought for the morrow"? Are not these the words of a great and mighty past, quite out of keeping with our decorative and dwarfed Christianity? Is not the fact that we practice the exact opposite of them a sign of our godlessness? The man who has God loves his enemies; it is impossible to possess God and to hate. The man who has God does not lay up treasures on earth; he does not need them. He is living in an endless reality, where all problems and temptations are easily met and solved; where all false pride and all anxiety for the needs of this life fall away. He who has God worries not, simply because he cannot worry.

There are no questions, no uncertainties, no mysteries to vex his soul, any more than they could trouble the play of the sunbeam. All is play because there is only one reality—God.

There was where Jesus stood—and where we do not stand. He was one with God—and we have no God.

It goes without saying that the possession of the living God affirms only one side of life, the sunny, positive side; and that it rejects the dark side of life because its unfathomable joy in existence swallows up the gloom. He who possesses the living God has no anxieties and no fears; he sees everything on its bright side: in any experience of life what is true is of God, and what is false is of his own folly. Everything has meaning for him, because everything is filled with God. He hopes all things, believes all things, endures all things, because he lives in God.

But the Christianity of to-day comes forward and charges the Social Democracy with godlessness. How is this?

The Social Democrats hunger and thirst after righteous conditions. Is that godlessness? The Social Democrats are the advocates of mercy. And shall they not then obtain mercy? The Social Democrats hate what is common, base and greedy. And shall they not be God's children? They are despised and persecuted on all sides. And shall God condemn them to hell? They lay up for themselves no treasures on earth, and declare war on money-getting. And shall they not belong to God? They do what God from the beginning has demanded of his witnesses; they open

their whole hearts to the poor and the oppressed. And shall they be without God?

Of a truth, there is nothing that shows up the present godlessness of Christendom so clearly as this reproach which the Christians throw in the face of the Social Democrats. Christianity has lived its self-satisfied life from century to century, without bothering itself about the poor, otherwise than to throw them the hard bread of alms. It hardly thinks of the commands of the Gospel on its every page to dispel the power of evil and sin. It serves God with all possible pious anxiety for salvation, but it forgets from age to age that God recognizes true service only in conquering evil and in loving the poor and lowly. It dreams its sweet dreams over its dogmas and ceremonies—and lo, when God awakes it through the thunder of the social revolution, the first word that Christianity can murmur through its sleepy lips is—"godlessness"!

What! a movement that bears the seal of the living God so clearly on its forehead, that takes so earnestly and literally those ideas that are the commands of His word, that proclaims itself so unmistakably the foe of His great foe, Mammon—this movement called godless by the champions of the Christian faith?

Is it not clear that there is a great gulf fixed between such a kind of faith and God?

CHAPTER II.

"THE SOCIAL DEMOCRACY DENIES THE EXISTENCE OF GOD."

We must now vindicate the truth of the assertions contained in the preceding pages. To that end let us consider first the reproach that the Social Democracy denies the existence of God.

I.

There is no need, says society, to prove the godlessness of the Social Democrats. They confess it in plain words. If there is any fact that is certain about the Social Democrats it is that they glory in their godlessness.

We have no intention of combatting this statement. We shall even spare ourselves the trouble of examining the passages bearing on the subject in the Social Democratic literature. Every one who knows these writings, even superficially, has seen that they are filled with this spirit. Yes, the Social Democracy denies God. Of that we have never had a doubt. We only ask: Does God really not exist because the Social Democracy denies His existence, or has the denial nothing whatever to do with the existence of God? That is the question that we should like to address to the mind of Christendom. And to make the question complete, we also add: Does God really exist because the Christians acknowledge Him, or does this acknowledgment have nothing to do with

His existence? To be sure, both questions are equally foolish. But, unfortunately, these questions, despite their folly, are still necessary. It is evident that neither the denial nor the affirmation of God's existence conditions the fact of that existence. God is what He is. Assertions, views, standpoints, systems of faith, all can and do contradict one another. Ideas may exclude other ideas; but they can not exclude realities. That which is does not any the less exist because we attempt to deny its existence.

The foregoing is very evident; but it is not so evident to our Christianity that certain consequences proceed therefrom. It is possible that Christendom is filled with God in speaking its reproach against the Social Democracy; and it is also possible that it is only speaking in defence of its own belief in God. Either God is speaking through the mouths of these men, or else the subject of their speech is themselves, their own belief in God. These are very different things, as different as God and man. In proof of this fact, which is so grudgingly conceded, if at all, let us turn for a moment to the history of the Church. From the very earliest days of the consolidation of the Catholic Church it was the custom of her heads and leaders to claim for their words and works the authority of the living God. Every dogma and every ceremony owed both its rise and its efficacy to the spirit of God alone. Even to-day the most imposing party of Christendom, the Romish, holds to this view. And in the Protestant Church as well, there are members who declare that they are compelled to hold their faith in the evangelical creed in the same way. We

shall hardly go astray then in asserting that the Church has always viewed as the word and deed of God, or at least as proceeding immediately from His will, the things it has said and done really of its own impulse.

The question is: Has God ever cared at all about such claims? With awful anathemas the sister churches of Greece and Rome separated from each other, each stoutly maintaining that it alone had the truth and that its unfortunate sister was abandoned by God. Which church did God leave, then, the Greek or the Roman? Must either Byzantium or Rome be damned? And then, as Rome grew stronger and stronger in its infallibility, the only mediator of God's revelation to man, was it a blasphemous act for the Reformers to lay violent hands on this glittering crown of infallibility? They were consigned to the lowest hell; but God acknowledged their works so clearly that to-day there are many sons of Rome who confess that they see His hand in the mighty revolution of the human spirit which separated the evangelical from the Roman Church.

And if to-day a great party declares war on all religion, shall we, in the light of the teaching of the past, see in this only a sign of godlessness?

Nay, do we not see rather that God and Church, God and religion, are not one and the same thing; that the living God forever concerns Himself but little with the dogmas that Christians manufacture about Him? Numerous already are the dogmas which have been imposed in the name of His holy and inviolable truth and under pain of eternal damnation, but which His all-powerful spirit has swept away like the straw

before the wind. The lesson of history is that there are two tendencies in the course of events to be kept carefully distinct; on the one hand there are systems of faith which various ages have set up as unalterable norms of truth, on the other hand there is the unceasing stream of vital development which now sweeps away with violence and now gently undermines the most irreproachable systems; they must give way to the higher truth. On the one hand is man, always anxious to write eternities on the sands of his short existence; on the other hand is God ever wiping out these futile lines, and so leading an upward-striving humanity along the way to the eternal verities. It is natural and in accord with the weakness of men that they should be found on the first side; but it is more in accord with God's nature that we should grasp the truth of the latter side, and see in it alone the power of the divine will.

Now what has been the invariable course of official Christianity? It has at every decisive moment of its development set dogma and ceremony in the place of God. And to-day it is battling hard, at least in its Protestant branches, to rid itself of the consequences of this fatal substitution. But still it does not dare to look the living God in the face; it still confuses religion and God, opinion and inspiration, belief and life. It cannot rid itself of the evil past. Therefore does it speak so glibly of the godlessness of a movement behind which stands the living God.

2.

In proof of what has been said, let us turn to the

utterances of the Christian Social Reform party of Germany. This party does not, to be sure, represent the opinion of Christian society as a whole, but it does represent the furthest limit to which any fraction of the evangelical Christendom of to-day will go in approaching the Social Democracy.

I have before me those famous first addresses which Stoecker, the founder of the Christian Social Reform party, made to the Social Democratic workmen. Throughout their pages there is only here and there the slightest recognition of what the Social Democracy has accomplished. Instead, there is a mass of dictums, embodying a thorough condemnation of the movement. For example: "You cannot reach your ideal in any other way than through a bloody revolution." "When a man offers to help you to gain meliorations you scornfully reject such help, and declare that you will have no compromises. You will have only the new social state; thus you alienate all other men from you and your hatred spoils everything." "Gentlemen, you hate your country, you hate Christianity, the gospel of the grace of God." "Yes, you are sailing with the storm; your sails are red, and the name of your ocean is blood." Scattered between these ejaculations are passages in praise of Christianity, and at the end comes the weak conclusion: "We cannot promise you a social state such as your agitators promise, but we know your needs and your cares; and we are ready to do everything in our power, working in common with you, to improve your condition. And if the great labor-party consents again

to live in peace with the other classes of society, then the help will be easier to give than now."

The Christian Social Reform party is a child of weakness and not of strength; it is a manifestation of unfaith and not of faith; ill-considered and unjust. Let us show this briefly.

The same Stoecker who comes into the lists so jauntily, as if it were a question of disciplining a few unruly schoolboys, says in his speech on "A Sketch for the Program of the Christian Social Reform Party:" "It is the great merit of Socialism that it has called our attention to the social question, that it has fixed our minds during the last fifteen or twenty years more and more on social conditions, and that it has made every honest man in the German Empire ask himself: 'What can be done to help the laboring classes?'"

How unjust, in the face of this admission, are the terms in which he characterizes the Social Democracy! This same Church that allowed itself to hear from the lips of one of its most renowned and gifted servants the frightful reproach that it was only through the Social Democracy that it had been roused to some grasp of the social question—that is to say, to recognizing the fact that the great majority of the people are the victims of an open system of robbery at the hands of the upper classes, that great numbers must beg their daily bread, that immortal human beings (created in God's image, as the church teaches) are compelled daily to expose themselves and their families to humiliating and revolting conditions in order to get bare subsistence; these same Christians, I say, in

whose ears the misery that long has cried to heaven began to be heard only a poor fifteen or twenty years ago, of a truth had every reason for appearing in a humbler, a juster and a kinder guise before the Social Democracy. The Church should have said, "We are ashamed that these men have had to show us our neglected duty, we confess our great fault, and we hasten to make amends for the guilty past by saying frankly, boldly and undeterred by the consideration of the rich and the powerful: the Social Democracy is right in its demands and in its aims; though it may make grave mistakes, its purpose is the purpose of the gospel—and our purpose is the same."

The Christian Social Reform party did not so speak. And that is the reason why it remains so weak and inefficient to-day. It failed in its first step. It assumed the tone of censure and not the tone of recognition. And this came from its little faith.

It was lack of faith that painted the Social Democracy as a red spectre of revolution on the cloudy horizon. It was lack of faith to reproach these toiling and oppressed men, abandoned and despised by the upper classes of society, with godlessness, and so to discredit them in the eyes of the nation. It was lack of faith to confront them with the rash words which in their desperation they had uttered against "tyrants" and the like. It was lack of faith to say to them: You are the lower classes, you have no education, you do not know how things really are. Stoecker forgot that the men whom he was opposing were poor and unhappy, unhappy even in their hatred, unhappy above all because while they had the sure conviction that

their cause was great and true it met only with hostility from official society. It is lack of faith to fight the Social Democracy with the weapons of Protestant Christianity, instead of seeing in the movement the hand of the living God.

Here we come back to our earlier statement: there are two powers in the course of events—system and progress. System stands still; progress presses forward. Even Protestantism, even the Protestant Church, is a system of the gospel and not the gospel itself. Fortified in this system the Christian Social Reform party took up the battle against the Social Democrats. The party forgot that above all systems rules the living God. They beheld the Social Democrats in the light of their system and not in the light of the living God. Hence all the criticisms of the Social Democracy—and behind the criticisms all the fear of the Social Democracy. Hence also the cheap solution of all problems in the words, "What you ask for is impossible"—and behind these words, terror.

3.

Yes, the evangelical Church has forgotten the living God. It no longer knows that every great movement for which the Bible stands, even that which called the Protestant Church itself into being, has appeared foolish, impossible and blasphemous in the eyes of the men who lived side by side with the prophets of such movement. It was foolishness in a Moses to bid defiance to the powerful Egyptian despot—but to-day the children of the Christian Sunday Schools are taught that his deeds were the deeds

of God. It was an "impossible" undertaking to lead a great people through the wilderness—but all subsequent generations even to our own day have sung of the glory of this "impossible" deed. Could there be a greater piece of foolhardiness than Gideon's, when he led his three hundred to attack the Midianites encamped over against him like a myriad of locusts? Yet this very incident is held up to the tender youth of our land as example of a shining faith in God! The pretensions of a David were rash, foolish and godless; the preaching of an Isaiah was blasphemous in the judgment of the priests and the pious; the work of a Jeremiah was an outrage upon a menaced fatherland. The prophets of Israel were all revolutionary agitators with wild and dangerous ideas—but it is just these men who are now held up to us as exemplar champions of God. Jesus was a seducer of the people, a blasphemer, a friend of outcasts, of publicans and sinners, his apostles the scum of society—but it is on Jesus and the Apostles that the Christian Church of to-day is built. And what shall we say of Martin Luther, whom his contemporaries from the Kaiser down to the poorest peasant regarded as the prophet of Antichrist, whose "soul-destroying" works filled the world with horror? To-day this same Luther is the rock and the refuge of a mighty Christian Church. And now this very Church which itself was born of the "impossible" raises its brazen shield against the "impossibility" of a new and great movement, and brands it with the reproach of "revolutionary folly."

Of a truth, the evangelical Church has forgotten

the living God! It has forgotten Him in that it cannot look upon the strength of the Social Democracy without immediately belittling it, reducing it to its own spiritual stature. It calls the Social Democracy dangerous because the Social Democrats do not share the prejudices of the evangelicals. It speaks of a great abyss into which the Social Democrats are pushing the intoxicated masses, because the Social Democrats do not confess the Christianity of the day. It ceaselessly celebrates the preserving power of its own faith, without which every social movement must sink and vanish in the sands of time. Meanwhile the Social Democracy is spreading out further and further, and the boasted powers of the Church have less and less opportunity to make their influence felt. The Church boldly asserts that it alone is able to solve the social question, in spite of the fact that it was only fifteen or twenty years ago that it began to perceive that there was such a question. The Church has unbounded confidence in the wholesome effect of its dogmas, and forgets that from the very beginning of its official history it has stood in the way of progress, that it has preached fire and sword against every movement that has run contrary to its own interests. The Church imagines that it can dominate this new movement of the spirit of men by virtue of its overwhelming power, as if the witness of all history did not prove the exact opposite; but it does not seem to think for a moment of beginning with itself and of learning a new faith, a new hope and a new labor. It speaks as ever of salvation, of grace, of redemption and of judgment, with its gaze fixed on the past. It confuses

systems, words, views, traditions with life. It is unconcerned that its gospel is not the gospel of Jesus Christ, its confession not filled with his spirit, its faith a dream, and no longer that communion with the powers of eternity in which a Saint Paul found inspiration. But more of this later. For the present we wish simply to make clear what effect Christianity's confession of the living God should have on its attitude toward the Social Democracy.

4.

The Social Democracy does in the main profess atheism. It declares religion a matter of private concern only. It does not believe in an eternal life. It regards Christianity as an outgrown faith. Its dogma is materialism—materialistic interpretation of past history and materialistic postulates for the present and future.

All this is undeniable. But we do not believe that there is any real danger for mankind in all this. Over against the fears of good Christian souls we set the single fact that God lives. In this one statement we are of one accord with their creeds; we simply find that ecclesiastical Christianity and the Gospel draw different conclusions from this fact. Ecclesiastical Christianity concludes from God's existence the necessity of pious doctrines and of artificial morals derived from these doctrines; the Gospel concludes from the existence of God that the whole world belongs to Him. Christianity excludes the world; the Gospel includes the world. For Christianity the confession of God stands at the end of a long and labored spir-

itual process which individuals and nations alike have to pass through; for the Gospel it stands as clear as the light of heaven above all processes of development and all differences of opinion. The Gospel says: Ye have the living God; that is enough. But for Christianity it is not enough; not enough to satisfy the Christian's ambition, his honor, his fears, his doubts, his little faith and his no-faith. The Christian must invent all kinds of pious works, which indeed may be inspired by the Gospel, but which are performed in the spirit of self. Therefore do we say that the Christianity of to-day has lost the living God.

What difference does it make to him who possesses the reality, God, whether the Social Democrats deny God or not? They do deny Him, to be sure; they often do it in rude and exasperating fashion; they despise the Christians and ridicule them. But how can that harm men who have the living God? The Social Democrats maintain that they have no need of God. Has God himself then need of thy anxious, excited aid, O Christianity? Put thyself in the place of God's Being and see how petty, how ludicrously petty this denial seems to thee then. "They rail at all that is holy"—but thou hast the living God. "They say, There is no God"—but they say it of the God who pulsates within thy breast. "They recognize only matter"—but thou knowest that God is the only reality. Oh let them talk, let them rail, thou and thy God are not harmed thereby. Why dost thou take them so earnestly? There is but one thing that is real: God. Is there aught beside Him to fear?

Dost thou not see that all that men can say is

only an idle dream when measured against the reality which thou dost know? Good and evil, light and darkness, wisdom and folly—are these and the like contradictions to be compared with that great unity which fills thy breast? "The Lord," says the second Psalm, "laughs at them." Why then shouldst thou hide thy face in fear and trembling? He speaks now and then a word with his adversaries, and in His own good way leads them to the sense of divine majesty—but thou hast no faith, no power except to tremblingly lisp thy feeble fault-findings. And above all He has pity on the children of men: "He hath not dealt with us after our sins, nor rewarded us according to our iniquities." Why then dost thou not stretch out thy hand to the "godless," and see rather what they have of good, than only how they err? Why, O Christendom, dost thou tremble before the Social Democracy; why do its victories at the polls rob thee of thy sleep; why do ye draw together factions that hate each other to make void the victories of the Social Democracy? We have already said it; Christendom lacks the living God.

Yes, Christians, even the evangelical Christians, are afraid of the Social Democrats. For what other reason are the Christian Social Reformers busying themselves so earnestly with the Social Democratic program (which they pronounce "impossible") rather than admitting the fact that programs do not signify anything at all? It is a matter of indifference how the Social Democrats justify their postulates scientifically, just as it is a matter of indifference to

the Kingdom of God what the Christian dogmatics are. Dogmatics here and dogmatics there. It is of no consequence to us what they think of the future, and the main thing is not that we should meet their thesis with a thesis equally well grounded in science. We have made but little progress when we have called them "atheists." The very existence of the Christian Social Reform movement is a confession of failure in Christianity itself. Where it is a question of thesis against thesis true Christianity refrains from the argument, for its only claim is to have the living God—and He is not a "standpoint" for any party.

To make the Gospel a standpoint is to spoil it. It is not opposed to any particular theory because it makes nothing of theories at all. It gets at the moving spirit in all affairs, and holds to that, concerned only to condemn or to commend that spirit. It needs no system; it is free of all the paraphernalia of systems. It has the living God. On the other hand, Christian Social Reform is nothing but the contest between the theories and postulates of official Christianity and those of the Social Democracy. It is a contest between non-essentials, and it takes place on a theater where the great forces that are making for the advancement of the Kingdom of God do not appear. God is bringing His designs to accomplishment, but He hardly needs the help of the Christian Social Reform. It is too pedantic for Him to use it; it has too much of the trader spirit.

Let us see of what sort are the measures which the Christian Social Reformers have devised for the

discomfiture of the Social Democrats and the salvation of society.

5.

PROGRAM OF THE CHRISTIAN SOCIAL LABOR PARTY.

GENERAL PRINCIPLES.*

1. The Christian Social Labor Party has for its basis the Christian faith and the love of King and Fatherland.

2. It repudiates the principles of the Social Democracy as unpractical, unchristian and unpatriotic.

3. It strives for a pacific organization of laboring men, to open up the way for needed practical reforms, in co-operation with all the other factors in the life of the State.

4. It aims at narrowing the gulf between the rich and the poor, and introducing a greater economic security.

SPECIAL OBJECTS.

A. The Organization of Labor.

1. The introduction of obligatory unions in each separate industry throughout the whole Empire, and their uniform regulation of apprenticeship.

2. The erection of tribunals of obligatory arbitration.

3. The compulsory establishment of income funds

*The principles of the Christian Social Labor Party will be of peculiar interest to wide-awake Americans, for just such inadequate and confusing ideas are beginning to take root here. But capitalism will not grant even such reforms until forced by the fear of Socialism.

for the care of widows, orphans, invalids and the aged.

4. The authorization of the unions to represent the interests and the rights of the laborers before their employers.

5. The responsibility of the union for contracts entered into by the laborers.

6. State control of the unions' finances.

B. The Protection of Laborers.

1. Prohibition of Sunday work, and abolition of children's and married women's labor in the factories.

2. A normal working day, somewhat varied in the different unions.

3. Energetic propaganda for international laws for the protection of laborers; and, until this goal is reached, a sufficient protection of the laborer by national laws.

4. Protection of the working people against unwholesome conditions in their places of labor and in their homes.

5. Re-enactment of the laws against usury.

C. State Employment.

1. Management of the present property of the State and of the commune in a manner friendly to labor, and extension of state-ownership as far as it is economically advisable and technically feasible.

D. Taxes.

1. Progressive income-tax as an equalizing counterpoise to existing or future indirect taxes.

2. Progressive inheritance tax in the case of large estates or distant relationships.

3. Stock-transfer tax.
4. High taxes on luxuries.

E. On the Part of the Clergy.

1. Sympathetic active participation in all efforts directed towards the physical and moral welfare and religious elevation of the whole people.

F. On the Part of the Owners of Wealth.

1. A hearty advance to meet the lawful demands of the poor, especially through influence on legislation, and through all possible increase in wages, and shortening of the hours of labor.

G. As to Self-help.

1. Cheerful support of the unions as the equivalent of all that was good and useful in the guilds.
2. High respect for one's personal and vocational honor, the elimination of all coarse pleasures, and the cultivation of family life in the Christian spirit.

6.

Now, as a matter of fact, if the Social Democracy has served only to impress these harmless, unobjectionable precepts on the Christian consciousness, it has missed its mission utterly. If all that is involved in this great movement is to bring into operation Stoecker's program of the Christian Social laborers, then we have no need to speak of the social question. For in that case we have many (and not altogether new) social questions, but not the *one* question that is burning to-day in the hearts of all educated men. Whether it be Stoecker's program or Naumann's, that which is really weighty is not there. What Stoecker

and Naumann had in mind when they wrote on social questions is of subordinate interest; brilliant, to be sure, as is everything they say, none of it has weight enough to claim more than passing attention. We shall soon see where the true significance of the Social Democracy lies. First, however, I am going to consider somewhat more closely the program of Stoecker with its later modifications by Naumann, because it illustrates so clearly the insufficiency of their mode of treatment.

Especially noticeable is the place so ostentatiously given to Christianity in the system. It has only decorative significance, however. The banner of Christianity is raised to attract the eyes of the world, but the contents of the system have nothing to do with Christianity. One can agree with each single article without taking one's stand "on the ground of the Christian faith," or even on the "love of King and Fatherland." One hardly understands why these phrases are brought in. If it is meant to suggest that the program is that of a "Christian" social order, one cannot see why it does not just as well fit a purely "human" order, without any specific Christian implication. On the other hand, if it is to serve as the program of a realizable socialism, in contrast to the "impractical" Social Democracy, one cannot see why this very sober and rational program should have to sail under the flag of Christianity. One would have to assume that Christianity alone is able to bring to pass the practical—an assumption which is manifestly untrue, and which would be of small credit to Christianity if it were true. We had every right to expect

from Stoecker, after his powerful sermons calling the Social Democratic laborers to repentance, that his Christianity, preached as the sole salvation, would be the center of a positive program for the betterment of the condition of labor; that he would be most diligent to develop a new order of things out of the depth of Christianity itself. But, nothing of the sort did he do. What is meant for example, when the clergy are bidden to show a loving and active sympathy "with all endeavors directed towards the increase of physical and spiritual welfare, and the moral-religious elevation of the whole people"? To what endeavors are the clergy bidden to give aid? Those which have Christianity for their source, or those which proceed from an entirely different source, and which merely find a support in Christianity? And what kind of bodily and spiritual welfare is to be considered elevating? Will it include those manifestations of civilization which are indifferent or hostile to Christianity; will it include such, without their being reproached as not contributing to spiritual well being? And what meaningless phrase-making it seems to speak of the moral-religious elevation of the whole people, in the face of the fact that nothing is so disrupted, nothing is in such hopeless confusion as the religious ideas of modern men. Furthermore, how are we to take it that to the possessing classes is merely made the weak appeal to meet cheerfully the "just demands of the possessionless classes"? What must the masters of finance, the great capitalists and proprietors think of these timid demands? Does it not seem as if every phrase were left in the air on purpose, in order to

waft the bark of Christian Social Reform safely past this most dangerous of all rocks?

Indeed, a man who did not know Stoecker better might be inclined to agree with the saying of Franz Mehring that "The Christian Social agitation which Stoecker started in January, 1878, was conceived in the interests of the ruling classes, and in their interests alone." ("History of the German Social Democracy," No. 31, p. 391.) But it is unfair to attribute this purpose to Stoecker. It is just as indisputable, however, that in this point (the question of private ownership) his Christianity leaves us in the lurch. We shall come back to this point later.

In a word, the entire separation between the religious and economic factors which we find in this program is strikingly noteworthy. In it Christianity has no independent meaning; it serves only to mark a point of view, and remains alongside the practical demands without blending with them.

Naumann likewise follows the same course. He declares with commendable directness: "Naturally, the religious side is only one side of the Christian Social program; the economic side must be in harmony with it. ("What is Christian Social Reform?" No. 1, p. 16.) In this single sentence the whole weakness of Christian Social Reform is avowed. A Christianity that speaks of the religious as only one side of the program, needing to be completed by the economic side; a Christianity that knows how to divide into nice categories all the questions that it deals with, instead of deriving them all from one great central thought, such a Christianity is a shattered power, a half-thing

from which nothing complete can be expected. He who sees only the many and not the one, who handles every question as an independent one on its own detached basis, who speaks with equal emphasis now of the religious and now of the economic standpoint, lacks the unifying vision which sees the essential. He can talk of everything—and that is the sad part of it; for he who has anything to say talks only of that one thing. Christianity has this one thing, or rather this one person, though it no longer knows it. Christianity has been acquainted with the immediate God, but it loves rather the many mediators. "Now a mediator is not a mediator of one," as Saint Paul said, "but of many; but God is one." (Gal. 3, 20.) We repeat, Christianity does not know the living God.

7.

In his "Thoughts Towards a Christian Social Program" (*"Die Hilfe,"* June 2, 1895), Naumann combines the following arguments:

Jesus Christ is the true help.

Materialism had to come because Christian teaching had underrated the material side of life.

A system of political economics has never been fully realized.

Science is an inconvenient but necessary accompaniment of a popular movement.

Measures of political economics may be tested as to practicability by their capability of being reduced to paragraphs of a legislative bill, or to statutes of an organization, or to specific rules for action.

The two chief questions of current economics are

the question of capital and the question of organization.

In the increasing concentration of capital in the hands of a few we see a serious economic evil. Great industries which could without damage be conducted by officials are ready to become industries of the State, as soon as the State gives guarantee that the conditions of labor can be improved in respect to freedom and security of life by the transfer to State control.

To live on interest, rent or profits without producing anything is morally inferior to living on wages for labor. Private ownership of land, in the country at least, must be preserved at all hazards.

The union of single groups of workers is desirable in the interests of the development of trade, and also of the efficiency of the working class as a whole.

Aid through public or private charity ought not to be resorted to until self-help through voluntary organization has proven insufficient.

Enforced idleness is a fundamental evil of our social condition.

Here is much that is good and useful, but not the one thing needful. And still, after all, it is that one thing that we expect of Christianity. We can easily understand in the light of the above expressions the disgust of the Social Democrats for the Christian Social Reformers. It certainly does look as if the latter wanted to use Christianity only to hold up before the eyes of the world the shield of faith, and in the shadow of that shield to prepare the way for a skulking reaction. It looks as if they cared only to discredit thoroughly the Social Democracy and to sub-

stitute for its unsparing postulates measures which in detail sound very fine, but which in the end serve only the reactionary powers. For the strong stroke of wing of the Social Democracy they substitute a weak fluttering on the ground; in the place of a bold defiance they give us a clever inoffensive speculation; from the great impossibilities they turn back to the possible—and that in a society which pines for the cleansing breath of the storm-wind.

8.

Let us for a moment imagine Jesus in relation to the present society. Which one of the two parties could claim him, the Social Democratic or the Christian Social? What must we think of a society which in the name of Jesus deals with reform according to the measure of a present ruled by Mammon? To such a pass has the Church come that it fights under the banner of Jesus against his Gospel. It wields the sword of the spirit—to quench all that is spiritual. It uses the word of God—in order to falsify the divine. It is pious, but its piety is godlessness.

Not to speak of those among the Christian Social reformers who maintain that social misery has nothing to do with the real concern of Christianity (like Dr. M. von Nathusius in his "What is Christian Social Reform?"), do even the others really think that the enemy, the terrible enemy, Mammon, will let himself be overthrown by these semi-Christian, semi-practical sentences? Do they not see that he will never be conquered by words but only by deeds? What

does he care for words? He knows that all phrase-makers lie securely bound in his chains. For centuries he has had the Church making phrases, and all the time fastening his bonds more and more firmly on the Church. And now that the Church is getting tired of its bondage and rousing itself to look its mortal enemy in the face, it finds nothing better again to use than—the words of Christian Social Reform. Why? Is it not just because the Church itself is so firmly attached to that same Mammon which it is fighting? Does the Church fear at all for its own inner life? Does it mourn having to abandon its faith? Why is it so willing to deceive itself with the Christian Social program? Does it see the true state of affairs and yet refuse to see it? Why does it have only words, why no deeds? It is because the Church has no God.

The Church is held together by her Christian tradition. She regards her dogmas of God and divine things as the final truth, and for just this reason it is impossible for her to recognize the hand of God in the events which are surging around her. She wishes to defend herself as God's institution, and she is only defending herself for her own selfish ends. She thinks that she is concerned to preserve religion for the people, but unconsciously she is concerned to preserve her own self. She undertakes to direct the new and dangerous thoughts of men towards God, but she only directs them to her own pious meditations. Doctrines, ideas, opinions are her curse. What she teaches and preaches are—mere thoughts. She warns and rebukes—and it is only opinions. She comforts and

soothes—and it is merely a speculation. She preaches, alas! not in the spirit of the Lord, but only in beautiful words.

Everywhere in the Church of God there is strife over the gospel's choicest treasures, strife over Jesus, over the Cross, over the Resurrection, over the Faith. Words, words, words. Good intentions, noble resolves —how many clergymen with the purest ideals does the Church count in its communion? But the enemy cannot be met with intentions, resolves, ideas, opinions —only with a new spirit, with fire and sword, with the power of the Living God!

9.

And these very flames of fire are bursting forth in the Social Democratic ranks. There lies before me the opinion of a man of liberal views on the Social Democrats. It reads as follows: "Do you not see that this movement is as necessary as the conflict of classes in the middle ages and in the mad year 1848? Does not the future of the German nation rest for the greater part with these 'comrades'? Go into the workshops and see those gleaming eyes, those healthy temples behind which psychic powers as yet unexhausted and unspoiled are pulsing, powers which one day will be enlisted in the service of the Fatherland. We see now only the bitterness and rancor of the laboring classes, and do not recognize the great and powerful force that is slumbering there. There is the young Siegfried, who is forging the victor's sword for himself. We see him now only at his toil and trouble." (Count Richard du Moulin-Eckerd in the

"Free State," reprinted in the "Rights of the People," 1903, No. 143.)

Fire, power, spirit this young party has in such measure that men of every class begin to seek its alliance. On the other hand, they are maligned and cursed everywhere; they are painted in blood-red colors to thrill a sated and enervated society.

In the salons of the upper classes men talk with shuddering apprehension of the future society of the Social Democrats—that innocent creation of an enthusiastic fancy. The bourgeois press is never tired of calumniating them to please its grateful circles of readers. And yet when one meets these men—what a different picture! I will not try to force a moral and say that on one side is only virtue and excellence and on the other only darkness and evil. No. Men are faulty everywhere, in all parties. But this much we must confess; nowhere else have we met so great and so pure an enthusiasm for high purposes, neither among the conservatives nor among the radicals, nor in any religious party. All the religious parties are paralyzed by Mammon's friendship. Only the Social Democracy stands out against Mammon as a pronounced enemy, irrespective of the individual interests of its members. They are comrades in the cause—the Social Democracy for mankind. They are filled with a noble ambition and reverence for humanity. The Social Democracy has one great purpose that inspires it. What is this purpose?

The Social Democracy itself hardly knows what is the answer to that question. And this is just its advantage over all the other parties. They all know

so well just what they want. Alas, it is so easy to compass the narrow circle of their wishes. He who strives for that which cannot be taken in at a glance; whose activities do not lie within fixed bounds; whose aims cannot be summed up in clever phrases—he alone has a real will. Behind such a will stands the living God.

Did the prophets of Israel, driven by the spirit of God, know just what they wanted? See how a Jeremiah shudders as he faces his fate. He would rather die than live as he must. But, so live he must. And to-day the Social Democrats carry about a great irresistible *must* in their hearts. Whither it will lead them they know not. They need not know—another knows.

To this *must,* O Church of Christ, thou oughtest to join thyself, or else to set over against it thine own *must.* If thou hast no *must* to put in the place of that of the Social Democrats, then hast thou lost thy right to judge them. The very fact that thou dost fall with such emphasis on their "scientific" theories, that thou dost think to meet theory with theory, postulate with postulate; that thou art caught fast in the brambles of propositions and quibbles, proves that thou hast lost the right to judge. Thou hast no *must*—thou hast no God.

10.

From our point of view, the scientific theories of the Social Democrats are of no account whatever. Did it make any difference how the early Christians interpreted the new impulses whose servants they were? Did the mighty power which swayed them depend on their uncertain dogmatic gropings? Was

it the chief feature of the Reformation that its champions thought out the theories in which they hoped to express the new spiritual forces of the day? "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh or whither it goeth." And if to-day the breezes are echoing with the promise of the future commonwealth, the theories of surplus value, and the like, does that fact exhaust the real meaning of the Social Democratic movement? Is not the true significance of the movement rather the wonderful inspiration of a vision to create some new great thing? Let the theorists among the Social Democrats sit dreaming over their theories; he who to-day believes that the Marxist theory of surplus value, for example, is the all important thing in the new movement, does not realize how world-history proceeds, and does not recognize the hidden depths out of which each new event derives its motive power. To be sure, the Social Democrats imagine an entirely new society, and see perhaps only the economic factors. But it is not this or that particular idea of theirs, but rather their main conviction, that of the necessity of a renovation of our social life which is (in its very indefiniteness) the great God-inspired element of their activity.

The Social Democrats cherish a wonderful hope in their hearts; they speak and sing of a brotherhood of nations, a golden age of equality and liberty. We laugh at them—and they bear it; we scold them—and they remain unmoved; we ridicule them—and they expect nothing else. They know that the present world has no room for them—hence they prepare the way

for the new order. They have recognized the fact that the god of this world, Mammon, must fall. They make no truce with Mammon, they have no need of vain words; of riddles and sophistries. They speak what they think, and let a whole world jeer them. Mammon is the arch-enemy of mankind, but Mammon cannot fall before good intentions alone; he will fall only before deeds. And when Mammon falls, then comes the new age. Yes, a new age, and not simply a new heart. That is their great *must,* which compensates them for all the obloquy which a trembling and self-blinded society heaps upon them.

Must they not say that the differences between men shall cease, since these differences come from the rule of Mammon?

Must they not demand that humanity make a great unity, since it is Mammon that splits humanity into a thousand fragments?

Must they not insist that the barriers of nationality fall, since it is Mammon that makes the pride of nationality?

Must they not prophesy a new age, since the present age is but the reflection of Mammon?

Must they not be despised as dreamers fantastical and fanatical, since this opinion is but a sign of the respect paid to Mammon by a decaying generation?

Must they not postulate impossibilities, so long as the possible and the practical mean simply the bowing down before the image of Mammon?

Unpractical, not to be considered, impossible are men's judgments on their program. And why? Because men fear to offend Mammon.

Fools and simpletons the Social Democrats are called. Yes, the divine has always been foolish and simple in the eyes of the world. No more honorable epithet could be given them than that which truth has always borne. God is working in them—and in the name of God the Church is fighting them.

II.

Mammon has subdued the world; not only the hearts and thoughts of men but their outward condition as well. He has appropriated to himself every invention, every improvement in the field of technical skill. That new knowledge which might have freed men from the brute power of physical laws and made them lords of nature, has become in Mammon's hand a tool to distress them, a slave-driver's whip under whose strokes the defenceless masses cringe. The nearer men think that they are approaching the goal of their desires, the more awfully are they deceived. And Mammon has done it all!

Who sets man against man like the beasts of the jungle? Who puts the weapons of murder into their hands? Who makes kings and princes the boon companions of base money-lenders? Who stops their ears so that they cannot hear the cry of the oppressed? Who keeps bringing India to the verge of famine? Who has reduced the Transvaal to a desert? Who daily subverts truth and faith in the people, and conscience in the people's servants? Who makes us bear the unspeakable banality of our modern life patiently

and unconsciously even, consumed as we are by our own interests?

MAMMON.

While we are wasting tears over the horrors that Mammon has brought to pass, while we are uniting in brotherhoods, societies and clubs, while we are making speeches in which we warn the "possessing classes to meet the just demands of the possessionless classes," while we are formulating wise systems and advancing noble postulates—Mammon sits at his bloody work. He does not say, "My kingdom is theory and speculation;" nay, he says rather, "The material world is mine."

How can we think of overthrowing his power without being willing to face a revolution in the conditions of society? How can we take the field against him without the firm conviction that his whole kingdom, the ownership of the world, must be wrested from him? The present conditions of ownership have developed out of the rule of Mammon, and only the servants of Mammon can be satisfied with them. They have sprung from the laws of avarice and privilege, the basest motives of the human heart. They must cease—when the battle against Mammon is waged in earnest.

These conditions of ownership must cease. This is the divine summons of our age. But this is exactly the summons from which the Church shrinks. The Church will "do all that it can." It will gladly do "the possible and the practical." It will willingly seek to soften hearts with advice in sermons, but it will not hear a word of change in the existing order

of property and production. It does not yet know what Mammon is. It is too close itself to Mammon to distinguish him. It belongs itself to the "possessing classes."

For all that, it is clear that if Mammon is to be overthrown, his chief source of power, the present status of property, must be abolished. He who would reduce his enemy to impotence must take away his source of nourishment. The laws of property are the nourishment of Mammon. Let unlimited private ownership of property continue to exist as it does today, and you will preach a thousand eloquent sermons against Mammon in vain; you will not alter a jot or tittle of his power. And Mammon will reward your toil with gold and with a respectable pulpit.

He likes these futile protests; he delights in these gestures as in the antics of a clown; he roars with good-natured mirth over them, and is ready to pay liberally the Christian simplicity which, pledged to words and abhorring deeds, strengthens his power in every word it speaks!

Well he knows the truth of the saying: the more they make of words the farther they are from deeds.

The curse of the Christian Church is this: It has surrendered to Mammon. Hence the ready tongue of the Church; for where there are many words with little desire to act, there lurks Mammon. Hence the parade of a belief in God. The Church is thus covering the chains which Mammon has woven around it. Hence the mere "practical" measures with which the Church responds to the social demands for re-

form, and the "possible" programs with which it meets the impossibilities of the Social Democrats. The possible belongs to the realm of Mammon. Only the impossible can conquer him. He is lord of this world. Alas for the Church that has no more faith in the great impossibilities! Its many words are the sad proof that it no longer has the power to act.

12.

There was a time when it was counted foolishness to belong to the Christian Church. In those days spirit and life glowed in its communion. The Church in the power of its "impossible folly" opened a new epoch in the world's history. That day has passed; and the Church has become rational, cultured, amenable. It accuses the Social Democrats of godlessness that it may still its own uneasy conscience. Could the Social Democrats confess *that* God in whose name the interests of Mammon are cherished?

The rôles have changed; the bold and powerful have become weak, and the poor and suffering have become bold and powerful.

The Social Democrats are doing what the Church should have done.

Where God should dwell there He is not found, and where one would not look for Him there He dwells. The words of old—when the first heathen came into His Kingdom—are true to-day: "I am found of them that sought Me not, and to a nation that was not called by My name I said, Behold Me, behold Me."

But to Israel He said: "I have spread out My

hands all the day to a rebellious people, which walked in a way that was not good."

And Jesus said: "The first shall be last and the last first."

CHAPTER III.

"THE SOCIAL DEMOCRATS SEEK TO UNDERMINE AND DESTROY CHRISTIAN TRUTH."

But Christians are heard voicing an energetic protest. They say: "We have not words alone; we have the power from above, the spirit of God. We have the promise of victory, for the religion of the Cross is the only salvation."

Let us consider closely this charge, that the Social Democrats seek to undermine and destroy the Christian truth, and that thus they will destroy themselves.

I.

Two voices come from the Christian Church; one of them delivers itself in the following manner:

"God has revealed himself in the person of Jesus Christ. He who speaks of God must speak of Jesus too; for he that hath not the Son hath not the Father. One need not speak in general terms only of a Providence that rules all things. We maintain that the living God can be grasped by us mortals only in the person of Jesus. And the knowledge of Jesus is a question of the heart. It is evident, then, that the gospel of Jesus has nothing to do directly with the social question. Christianity has only one real purpose. 'I am come,' said Jesus, 'that ye might have life.' But we have life in the full only in God, and we have God only in the forgiveness of our sins. Into this kingdom of death, misery and sin has burst the

joyful message of the Savior, who is our eternal refuge. Christ has made us free, free from fear, free from death, free from self to enjoy the glorious liberty of the sons of God. If this inner freedom is ours to assure us that there is no condemnation for us who are in Christ, then it is immaterial to us in what outward condition we find ourselves. 'If I have thee, I ask nothing else in heaven or earth.' All mundane conditions, health or sickness, poverty or riches, loneliness or happiness, freedom or slavery—all such things belong to the fashion of this world, and the fashion of this world passeth away. But the life of Christ in us, which is freedom, remains. The only purpose, I repeat, of Christianity is to bring us to this freedom, this eternal life." (M. von Nathusius, "What is Christian Social Reform?" pp. 14-15.)

So speaks one party, and the other party says: "The message that Jesus brought was a message that appealed to his age—the gospel of the Kingdom of God. In sermon and parable, in personal exhortation and in longer discourses he kept insisting on the one fact: The Kingdom of God is at hand, it is among you, ye may belong to it as soon as ye will. The glorious nature of the Kingdom he portrayed for all. It was a Kingdom of community in which all former inequalities and dissonances should be changed into an everlasting unity. We are the dear children of one God. The high and the low, the near and the far, the rich and the poor, the learned and the ignorant should all be one. No one should be despised henceforth because he had nothing, and no one should be honored henceforth because he had much. Mammon

should no longer rule the world, but men should seek higher things. Everything should belong to God, hearts and hands, houses and lands, powers and possessions. In God's service and in the love of the brethren one's life should be consumed." (F. Naumann, "The Social Program of the Evangelical Church," p. 18.)

The first party grants, to be sure, the practical significance of the gospel of Jesus in the world, and the latter grants that the transformation of the earthly life, as manifested by Jesus, does not exclude the question of the individual's salvation, but rather assumes it. The former does not intend to shut out the social question, nor the latter to slight the personal relation to the gospel. Only they emphasize respectively the inner and the outer factors in religion; the one the realization of individual freedom, the other the consummation of the Kingdom of God.

Both sides openly confess this conflict of views. For example, Nathusius writes: "We agree with Naumann when he says in *Die Hilfe,* 'In the superficial dead Christianity which echoes the views of the propertied classes, the living person of Christ is so obscured that pious people seriously ask themselves, Are we still Christians?' But when Naumann goes on to say: 'This announcement is the end of the spiritual office,' the words are not wise ones. We see how false the point of view is when we read that the entire significance of Christianity is in the discovery of the whole Jesus. So then, the Reformation fathers only preached a part of him, when they set the doctrine of the forgiveness of our sins through Christ's

blood as the keystone of their system, as opposed to a superficial rationalism. Did our fathers fail to preach the regeneration that comes from the forgiveness of sins?"

Naumann, on the other hand, says: "The soul of conservative Christianity is faith in the sufferings and death of Jesus Christ, by which men are saved. The religion of sacrifice and reconciliation was preached with zeal; the risen, living, present Jesus was embraced by all hearts. That was the merit of the regeneration of the old faith. The look at the Crucified One was life-giving once more. What did the man who was assured of his salvation, who knew that he was reconciled to God, and who beat down the evil tendencies under his feet, see in the Crucified? He saw the Lamb who bears the sin of the world, but he did not see with the same clearness the persecuted *man,* the man murdered by the religious and secular authorities of his country. In short, the modern proletarian will view the sufferings of Jesus as something still present in the world, and not (like the citizen of assured standing) as a drama passed. He will hold all that which is dear to the heart of every man in the conception of Jesus, but he will still see the matter as a more present revelation, because he himself is still struggling and toiling.

"Jesus lives. This faith takes the form: Lord Jesus, how would it be with thee to-day, if thou didst and saidst the same things as thou didst and saidst once on earth? Jesus lives not only as the dogma of the God-man, as the Lamb of God, sacrificed for our sins—he lives also in his undying words: "Ye can-

not serve God and Mammon." (*"What is Christian Social Reform?"* I. p. 59.)

Both Nathusius and Naumann are right, and both are wrong: wrong, because they cannot join these conflicting views in a higher unity. This leads us further.

2.

"Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day, and forever." If we ask the different Christian parties the meaning of this central truth of Christianity, we receive the most various answers, none of which can perhaps be disputed, but we do not receive *the* answer. Still the real answer is at hand, and readily understood, only men do not recognize it as the real answer. They bury it beneath all sorts of secondary answers. They have said it, however, when they say, "Through Jesus we are reconciled to God," and, "Jesus has brought to us the Kingdom of God."

What does this mean? Simply this, that with Jesus began the just appreciation of God among men.

We are convinced that this truth in its full extent and significance has never been grasped by Christianity. Therefore we must speak of it more closely.

We have seen that what is characteristic in the person of Jesus is that he represents for us the living God. Not only represents him, but embodies him. The appearance of Jesus on earth means that, from that time on, not the human but the divine prevails. That is the burden of his preaching of the Kingdom of God, of his signs and wonders, of his command to take up one's cross and follow him. It pulsates in his every word, it shines from his every deed. It is to this truth he leads us when he teaches us to pray,

"Our Father which art in heaven." For God he descends into the grave, and for Him he rises from the grave.

Jesus alters the values of all earthly things. He builds all values on the wonderful reality of God. This transformation of the values of human life is a process not yet complete. Herein is the battle which he left behind to his followers, the fire which he came to kindle on earth.

3.

This battle is the business of all his apostles. St. Paul formulates his Christianity thus: The righteousness of God is revealed in the Gospel. The duty of the Christian is to bring to the world the appreciation of God. The Gentiles and the Jews have abandoned God—the former to revel in the filth of sin, the latter to substitute a false worship of God, full of self-righteousness, for their real mission of being the people of God, that is, the people for God in the world.

The worship of temple and altar is vain, because it serves the interests of men and is no longer the expression of kinship with God. All that men can do to make terms with God by the work of their hands is false, for it is not our business to make terms with God. So all religion that consists in doctrines and ceremonies is reprehensible, for nothing must stand between man and God. St. Paul sees only stagnation and blindness in the Jewish piety; his soul hates every work that does not proceed from the Christian in communion with God. This communion he finds in

faith. Faith, in distinction from works, is simply the assertion of the divine, the victory of God, the righteousness of God upon earth. To live for God, that is faith.

So stood Abraham in the far distant past, and so would St. Paul have every one stand to-day. You have, he cries, full access to God in Jesus Christ; you belong to Him. Glory in your tribulation, for all tribulation, all that has straitened and oppressed you till now, henceforth has lost its power. Death has lost its sting, for the justification of life and all that makes the confidence of life has come into the world with Jesus Christ. Life, not death; strength, not weakness; grace, not condemnation; salvation and glory, not destruction and sin have now come into power. For the living God rules. You are dead to the sin which has held you in its oppressive grasp. Nought oppresses you, nought holds you, nought compels you more, for you live in God. You work for His Kingdom, you are bringing in His day. Even as in the past sin ruled unto death, so now let the grace of God rule through righteousness unto eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.

We live in the power of God, in the Kingdom of God; we serve Him body and soul in the service of righteousness. We belong no longer to self, we are His. With Christ we have died to the old world, to the old order, to the old principles and prejudices, to the old theories and opinions. We live in Christ, and we know that Christ has been raised from the dead and dies no more. Death shall never reign over him, for in that he died he died once unto sin, but

in that he lives, he lives unto God. Likewise we. God's life pulses in us and His spirit fills us.

We know only this, that we live for God, that we have trodden under foot all that has enslaved us until now, that we have done with the shadows of sin and death. We are servants of the righteousness of God, and it is written in our hearts that God will establish His Kingdom through us. We know now only the eternal. We have no more conflicts, and we need no longer to repine and doubt. One Lord, one faith, one spirit in whose victorious power we work.

So we Christians stand on a new ground. The good is no longer a law to us, but a potency. We are mastered by its boundless reality. Our task is no longer to distinguish between good and bad, for we know that all good is in the vision which we have seen of Jesus, and that to do good consists in nothing else than to impress the reality of this vision on a dead world. The Christian lives in the good, exists for the good. The good is no longer a proposition for him, it is his pulse-beat, his breath. To be good means to maintain the sovereignty of God on earth as in heaven. This is the marvelous simplicity that the Christian faith has found in the word of Jesus.

In the power of this simple truth, hell and perdition are done away. There is no condemnation for them that are in Christ Jesus, for they are God's. An undreamed-of glory opens before their eyes. We are convinced that the sufferings of the world are not to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed. The darkest shadows vanish before this light. Here is eternity, here is the living God. What have the

bondage of nature, the groans of its creation, the vanity of time to do with us further? How can the laws of nature trouble us, when they are solved in a higher Being, or what power have the deep riddles and the fatalities of this existence? All this must cease, for the creature is delivered from the bondage of the perishing order into the freedom of the children of God.

This is the truth which fills the soul of God's children. They are waiting for and expecting another world, and in it they create and bring forth. They are not idle, they die all the long day, they are led as lambs to the slaughter. But in all this they conquer through Him who loved them. "For I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord."

All history, all development, must serve this end. "God hath included all under sin that he might show mercy unto all." For of Him and through Him and unto Him are all things. Even if whole nations and races despise His name, even if His own people, the Jews, reject the faith, they all nevertheless serve His purpose. "I say then, did they stumble that they might fall? God forbid. But if by their fall salvation is come to the Gentiles, how much more by their fulness."

Does it not seem as if some such word as this were being fulfilled to-day, now that we Gentiles have received from the hands of the Jews (from Marx and

Engels and Lasalle) that impetus called the Social Democracy which is bringing us closer to the great aims of the Kingdom of God than any other force in our age?

And the other apostles write as St. Paul. "Blessed be God," cries Peter, "who according to his great mercy begat us again into a living hope through the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead." The spirit of eternal life breathes in the Epistles of St. John. That the righteousness of God alone is truth and substance is the message of every word of St. James. "Look for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ for eternal life," says Jude. And the last book of the Bible, the Revelation of St. John, ends with the invocation: "Yea, come, Lord Jesus."

They all expect the victory of the Kingdom of God. They preach of the great redemption which will extend to all grades of creatures, from men down to the dumb animals, from thrones, principalities and powers to the children and the simple. They see everything in a brilliant and harmonious light; they all press to meet that day in which God shall be all in all, when there shall be no more sorrow nor weeping—for the former things shall have passed away.

In such hope did they establish the first Christian communities. These communities came into being in the firm faith in the living God, and in God's power they battled with the powers of evil. For this they realized the promise that the gates of hell should not prevail against them.

With sad longing our modern Christianity looks back to that life lived in God's power. It

would itself taste that life, for it is sick and faint. The weight of the past is heavy upon it, and in vain does it strive to throw off that weight. In vain its fervent labors for truth, order and peace. Its preaching is powerless and ineffectual. Why? Because, while the early Christians stood firm in the certainty of the living God, uncertainty is the inmost soul of modern Christianity. The early Christians worked in the righteousness of God, but we in our own righteousness. There faith—here unfaith. There spirit—here dogma. There life—here religion.

The certainty of the living God. What does this mean? It means to understand all Christian truths as man's experience of God. Let us explain this statement somewhat more closely.

Christianity speaks of a doctrine of salvation. It knows by what precise steps man must ascend to God. It has taken centuries of toil for the Church to get clear on this doctrine. She has lost whole nations in the struggle. Finally she was irreparably split in twain when the storm-wind of a new spirit blew through her ceremonies. Then the Protestants too began to take refuge in their dogmas. The Protestant church became more of a doctrinal church than the Catholic even. Yet in spite of all, the two churches have more in common than they have in contradiction. Both teach a salvation and a heavenly bliss, with the way to reach this bliss; both comfort, warn, reprove, condemn and bless; both speak of the Gospel—but neither has the Gospel. For they both seek God, while the Gospel has Him. Their common lack is tremendous. They no longer know that the words of the Gos-

pel are the words of the living God. Let us cite a few proofs of this.

4.

Jesus promised the kingdom of heaven to children. Every simple person should understand Him. But what Christian does understand Him? Has not a bitter strife arisen over everything that Jesus taught and wrought? Do not the waves of a passionate fanaticism still surge about the silent mound of Golgotha? Is not the empty grave of the risen Christ still the scene of the quarrels of a factional Christianity? The eucharist—a meal of reconciliation once, of confessional strife now. Who does not think, when he hears the word *justification,* of the long and tedious history of struggle connected with that word? Who does not know that the word *atonement* has split two churches asunder? What is salvation, what is faith, what is Christianity? Who knows? There is doubt to-day even over what the Christian is to do in the world. We write and preach about all topics, but we have no clear faith. How is this? It is because we do not understand these doctrines of salvation as our experiences of the living God, but as separate portions of knowledge to be grasped partly by the intellect and partly by the emotions.

We no longer know that the atonement accomplished by Jesus means companionship with God. For the apostles, atonement was nothing else than the spirit of God in the community. Hence it was also redemption. To live with God, to give one's self to him, to obey his spirit—that and that alone was atonement and redemption. They called this experience of God "re-

demption" in distinction from the kingdom of darkness that lay around them. They called it "atonement" in distinction from the sins that had dwelt in their hearts. It was never anything else than life with God. Their inner life was no mysterious psychological phenomenon, but simply God Himself. They fought the battle of God when they withstood sin. They gave themselves to God when a martyr's death was their lot. They cultivated no special Christianity, spoke of no special party. They were intent on doing the works of God and not on laboriously proving a doctrine of salvation. They lived and moved and had their being in God.

It is clear that he who lives in the experience of God is in condition to live a whole and consistent life. He can judge every experience of life from this experience, and does not need to establish any theories or systems. He is not concerned with fine distinctions, subtilties and cavils. He does not speak of an inner life as in opposition to the outer one. He does not speak of Christian principles in distinction from worldly principles. He does not separate the religious life from the practical life. All these distinctions are for him artificial ones. He knows the living God, and hence it is clear for him that all realms of activity, be they deep in the heart or on the surface only, be they in the realm of matter or in the realm of spirit—are God's.

5.

The inner life is surely a reality. All that pious souls through the centuries have spoken concerning

their sweet communion with the Saviour is not folly and self-deception.

Who would dispute all the sufferers that have learned to bear their sorrows in the comfort of the cross; who could gainsay all the poor and afflicted who have found recompense for their misfortunes in the intimate joys of their faith? Can we say, Your faith is false, your hope is vain, your patience is folly? It was the power of this inner life that taught a defenceless Christianity to submit to the iron grasp of the Roman Empire, and inspired the first missionaries with their message.

Filled with this life the Reformers stood out against a secularized Church. Protestantism was born of a deep need of the human conscience—let us never forget that.

We can understand "conservative" Christianity when it defends a system that has accomplished so much. But that it will not recognize the world-renewing power of the spirit that has animated it, that it distinguishes so anxiously between inner and outer, here is painful proof of its poverty and of its godlessness.

How? The same God who works in the inmost hearts of men, shall He not also change the outward aspect of man's life? He who dries up the root of sin in the heart by the power of His word, shall He not also use His power where sin flourishes like the green bay tree—in the industrial world? Does God distinguish between inner and outer? Does not His energy work in every nook and corner of His vast creation? Did He not create matter itself out of the hidden depths of His word? He spake and it was done, He command-

ed and it stood fast. Does He not still and forever, out of His hidden springs of power, spread the majestic crown of the oak and fashion the slender stem of the pine? And ye would deny Him the power to burst the bonds of a society in which sin has bound men by a false tie, and to create a new humanity in which righteousness dwells? He must stand quietly by and see the soil, this inexhaustible earth which He has given men for their joyous occupation, become the monopoly of a class living in luxury, while their brothers beg bread from their hands! He must let this madness of Mammon continue unpunished its desolating robbery of one region after another!

Why do you turn from these questions and say: "They have nothing to do with the Gospel?" Does not the same fire that consumes the root consume also the branches and the twigs? Must not the same hand that punishes greed punish also the works of greed? He who condemns the "sin" of avarice, how can He be calmly content with our present conditions of production?

6.

Here you interrupt me and say: "Reconciled to God the heart can live in any conditions. Either—or. Either Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners and this salvation appears in just the fact that we are redeemed, in spite of the sin-searchings, the sufferings, the persecutions, the hunger, the jeopardy, the sword that still remains our portion here—or Jesus Christ came into the world to make the poor rich, the hungry full, and used the theme of the forgiveness of

sins as a means to this end." (Nathusius, loc. cit. p. 33.)

Thus you speak, not recognizing how godless an utterance you are thus publishing abroad. Does God recognize this "Either—or" of yours? No! That is your invention, after you have stifled God's living power in you and put in its place a comfortable dogma—comfortable for the rich and the sated, but not for the poor, to whom Jesus preached his Gospel!

Your "Either—or" is false. Christ did not come to save sinners in the sense in which you construe it. The salvation of the Gospel is not merely comfort for sinners—it is the possession of the living God Himself. And if a man's salvation consists in God Himself how can he escape the truth that God is a *whole* God who works salvation in every sphere of life; in the heart, indeed, but also in society?

You say: "A man can be happy even in the midst of evil conditions." No doubt. "I can do all things through Christ who strengtheneth me," says St. Paul; a man who nevertheless bore in his heart the burning desire for the "freedom of the enslaved creature." So speak those men who rejoice in hope when the end of all things is near.

But does the power to endure evil prevent us from declaring war against it? And if the poor victim himself cannot declare this war against evil, why do *you* not rise up for him as did the prophets of old, as did Jesus and his Apostles?

Why is one constantly hearing from your lips the one message and not the other? Why always the comfortable, the bourgeois deliverance, that every disturb-

ance of our present social order is dangerous and unsound; and never the sharp, decisive summons that we cannot serve God and Mammon? Why is it that you always console the poor with the future coming of the Lord, but never terrify the rich with the same theme—as Jesus did? Why never a complaint against the rich for their avarice, while you warn the poor so solemnly against covetousness?

I think that your Christianity is a Christianity of the rich, not of the poor. If so, it has no part with Jesus—for Jesus "preached the good news to the poor."

You speak of the "inner" life because you are in darkness, and your own "inner life" is darkness. You have no power to transform the external world which God has given men for the scene of their activities. It is because you do not know the living God.

7.

From the inner thought bursts the energy for the outward deed. The scientific inventor sits over his formulae, thinking, searching, until of a sudden the kindling thought lights up within him—an inspiration. Then matter, till then unavailing, begins to live and to form itself into shapes of art, into iron rods and mighty wheels, till the finished machine is there—the glory of thought. Everywhere matter is obedient to thought. Is it only in religion that this is untrue? Must religion alone keep the reward of her thought in the dark, hidden carefully from the eyes of men, who are perishing for her revelations? No! Man, even religious man, is no divided being, bearing two irreconcilable natures within him. What germinates within

his breast so marvelously must express itself in outward action. Soul and body belong to one another. And the body's field of action—the earth—God expressly made subject to man.

When in the depth of your hearts you ponder the mystery of redemption, when you bow in worshipful silence before the powers of God which live and work within your breast, when you have a taste of the victory over sin and the destruction of evil, does not this spiritual energy which fills your bosom kindle you to action? What sort of salvation is it that can stimulate the fancy, gratify the feelings, strengthen the will, but which turns away in affrighted impotence when it sees the door of the outer world open before it?

And how was it in the beginning of Christian history, in that age to which you look back so willingly? Did not the earliest community of Christians manifest the energy of their spiritual life in the common possession of goods among their members? If they thought it worth while to leave the world the story of this community of ownership, can we see nothing in it but a "touching attempt" to solve the economic question—"touching" and childish because our superior experience has long since taught us a better way? A better way? Is that true? Did not the strong words of our great Reformers attack real evils? Were they only words for the "inner" life and not for a degenerate social order?

No, you will never be able to prove that God's works avail only for soul and feeling and not for physical well-being. On the contrary, God's inmost

plans are for the eventual glory of the physical. "The end of God's ways is a physical order," says Oetinger, whom you reckon as one of yours.

Open your Bible. Every page will teach you that God sees the proof of obedience to His will in the outward circumstances of life, in the way in which men deal with the laws of the external world, which has been confided to them. You will see that God cares nothing for a piety that lifts its hands in prayer to heaven but is indifferent to the weal or woe of the poor. The injustice against which his prophets contended consisted not simply in evil thoughts, but in "economic" deeds. "Woe unto them," cries Isaiah, "who join house to house and field to field until there is no room left and they possess the land alone." (Is. 5, 8.)

How many of those who are zealous for the "inward Christianity" are under this curse, in these days of unlimited land-speculation? Only they are too contemplatively pious to notice it! Was it not just the contemplative piety of the middle ages that led to that frightful rule of Mammon, which from the throne of the vicar of Christ—of that poor Jesus, who had not where to lay his head—extended its grim scepter over lands and people? Is not the "inwardness" of our modern Christianity to blame for the odious hypocrisy which , like stagnant marsh water, poisons the meadows of our religious and ecclesiastical life?

Is not the Christian Church marked with a stigma of disgrace because it has a fine understanding of material relations when there is a question of receiving something, but none when the oppressed poor cry to

it? If property is only a side issue, why then so many avaricious and greedy priests, so many Christian speculators and swindlers?

Would party hatred and strife be so great in the Christian community to-day, would doctrines and opinions play so important a part, would folly and superstition so cast their broad shadows over the Church, if the Church had paid better attention to material things?

Instead of quarreling over things that no one understands anyway, instead of making conscience of questions that no one is able to solve, we ought to unite in some great common action. And where else could we find our efforts so beneficial as just in the outward life, the bodily condition of men?

But we cannot do this. We are so used to speaking of the insignificance of earthly conditions. This is a very convenient excuse to cover our own weakness. We have no power. If we had, the dark lairs (called dwellings) where we lodge our workers after we have worn them weary in the toil for Mammon, would soon be lighted with God's sun; the daily anxiety of the drudging masses who know not when the hour of destruction will strike for them would be turned into joy. For then we should have a heart for them, and that would mean that we regarded their bodies as well as their souls.

But our Christianity hinders us from this, our Christianity which makes us point the poor sufferers to the other world while we continue to distress them here.

Even if God is soon to open to them the gates of

heaven and "wipe away all tears from their eyes"—why, O Christians, do you not give them houses and gardens here, in which they may refresh themselves with a faint foretaste of the bountiful joys you promise them above?

Ah, it is so easy to promise the future—so hard to make things right here!

To be sure, many Christians are honestly concerned to help the poor. The long roll of institutions of Christian charity, strung like a necklace of pearls through the dark centuries of human misery, witnesses that the power of divine love is not yet extinguished in our Christianity. But, on the other hand, do not these very works of charity confess their impotence to the sufferers, do they not all say that what they do is all that can be done? They would like very much to expand and to spread, but they do not know of any *other* and completer help.

And yet this is too little. What kind of love is it which can bind up wounds only, but cannot prevent them; what kind of pity is it that cuts off branches of the tree of poison but dares not touch the roots? What kind of faith is it that declares inviolable the inhuman conditions of production which have created the rule of Mammon, and contents itself with softening in some degree the results of these conditions?

Is it not true that the same men who contribute out of their superfluity considerable sums to these works of Christian piety, are bringing into existence in their business life the very evils they are helping to relieve?

Are not all the frightful physical and moral evils,

the thousand wounds from which our body social is bleeding, the results of this system of production?

I know well that the sins of the poor do much to aggravate the evil, and that workmen who toil with unsparing energy for their bit of bread can ordinarily make out a living—provided that they follow your kind advice and do not raise too many children. But have those who profit by a mode of production which creates so many causes of sinning the right to remind the workers of their sins? Do such reproofs come with a good grace from those who allow themselves such ample dispensation from the counsels of diligence, moderation and economy they so eloquently preach to the poor?

8.

"But," you say, "avarice now reigns throughout the world. The world will not put away its sin and corruption. Human relations will not change until the judgment day dawns." I have often heard you speak such words. Permit me to reply that I can see nothing in them but loss of faith, loss of God.

Are we not Christ's witnesses on earth? Should we not bear his cross and for his will suffer even persecution and death? Did he not set himself in square opposition to the spirit of this world? Else why the cross? Is faith in Christ simply to comfort oneself in the midst of sin and to hope for the heavenly home? Were not the powers of heaven revealed in him? Said he not that he was come to bring life, and to bring it more abundantly? Shall he not save the world? Does he not set God over against

Mammon, the prince of the worldly system? Is his love only a gentle breeze, or is it the flaming fire which John the Baptist saw approaching to burn up the chaff?

To believe in Jesus means to say to sin, Thou must cease! and to evil, Thou must fall!

To believe in Jesus means to protest against the powers that are hostile to him.

To believe in Jesus means to be found in the power of the living God, the God who is coming, who is bringing on the times of his righteousness.

To believe in Jesus means to be ardent for the right against all injustice; to attack evil at its roots without considerations of utility or inability. It means to make the impossible true, the unattainable possible, the unrealized actual. For Jesus "makes all things new." Jesus has imparted to men the faith in the Kingdom of heaven upon earth. What kind of Jesus would he be who should accept as his last word the ideals of *our* church?

To believe in Jesus means to *love*. But love burns and glows. God is love, and God is a consuming fire.

But again you say: "The Gospel addresses itself to the hearts of men and not to their material conditions. It makes all things new from the heart out." I answer: Ye know not what ye say.

When are hearts the more shaken, when one shows the inward or the outward significance of sin? the evil thoughts or the dreadful consequences?

Is not the reason why the Social Democracy has spoken so clearly to the hearts of the people that it

has not scrupled to attack evil at its roots; so that even those who thought they had no need of the Social Democracy are coming into its fold? What does it mean to say, "Our gospel is not for the outward but for the inward man?" Does there not lie hidden in this untenable, godless distinction the bitter confession that our Christianity is exhausted, that it has no further power of deed, no spirit, no God?

"We, too," so you say, "hope for a final transfiguration of human affairs, but we are not allowed to set a hand to it ourselves, we must wait till God accomplishes it through His spirit." So you speak, and shut your eyes to what God has already begun to do.

For there is a stirring in the masses; there is a light and a glow in the depths. Flames are bursting forth. The lowly are raising themselves from the dust, and the mighty are trembling in their seats. Has this come to pass without God, this which agrees so closely with His word? You think God's hand is not in this movement, simply because the movement has gotten out of your own hands. You surmise that God reveals himself only in the way your own piety can conceive. But what does the Almighty care about your Christianity, so long as you are simply shielding your own impotence behind this name?

Yes, God is speaking to-day. God is working miracles, but of a different kind from what your traditional Christian formulas and your "inward" piety can understand—mightier, more elemental, more real. For God is a God of reality. His life cannot be woven out of systems of doctrine. He is bound to no one. As He once left His disobedient people and

appealed to the Gentiles who knew Him not, so can He to-day. "Or is God the God of the Jews alone? Nay, also of the Gentiles." (Rom. 3.)

Is He the God of the Christians alone? Nay, also of the Social Democrats. He gives His Spirit to whomsoever He will. Let not the Church forget that.

9.

"But the Social Democrats are the enemies of the Church, they blaspheme the Holy One!" Even thus did the Jews speak of Jesus, and later of Paul. Thus spoke the priests when the Reformers arose. Thus the official Church has always spoken.

You wonder at the enmity of the Social Democrats. But has not the Church ever since there were Social Democrats always preached against them? Did not the Church itself prejudice the minds of the people against the Social Democrats by unceasing charges of godlessness and of peril to society—even before society had time to test the character of the Social Democrats? As long as the Social Democrats were insignificant and without influence the Church showed them a scornful neglect; but when they began to appear as a power on the scene the Church visited them with passionate condemnation. For decades the Church had nothing but profound contempt for these "foes of religion and morality"; and even to-day it esteems nothing a greater disgrace than for one of its ministers to go over to the Social Democrats. And then you wonder that the Social Democrats (who do not yet expressly read in their Gospel the rule to repay evil with good) pay like for like! The Social

Democracy claims to be only an "economic" phenomenon. Why has the Church so hastily, so persistently, so unfairly emphasized in it what is the merest side issue—its atheism? Why is it that the Church rises up as a champion for God as soon as others deny him, but on its own ground behaves as though God were only a word? Perhaps God is but a word for the Church!

We will not enter into the past history of the Church to show how toward the end of the middle ages the Church had become only a house of merchandise and a den of thieves. Others have done that sufficiently. We shall confine ourselves to the present situation of the Church.

And here we find that the Church, Catholic and Protestant, is dominated by the spirit of Mammon.

Look at the attitude of the Church toward the rich and powerful and compare the treatment it gives to the poor and lowly—and then say whether we are right or not in our criticism. The rich pay large contributions to the Church, the poor little or none. Hence the ecclesiastical authorities defer to the rich and despise the poor. The rich have everywhere the best seats in the churches, the poor may sit where they can. A small matter perhaps, but an apostle of the Lord thought it a fault to be denounced. (James 2, 3.)

When a rich man leaves the Church they do their very best to keep him, no matter how little he may share the faith of the Church; but if a poor man goes they take no notice of it, however respectable his reasons. Anyone who will examine the conduct of the

churches in this matter will see that these assertions are incontrovertible.

The Church is afraid of men, and does not dare longer to preach the truth to them in freedom. It is disturbed when it offends and it shuns any extreme phrase, any thorough word. Why? It fears for its standing, its respectability, its money. There are honorable exceptions still, thank God, but the great majority of church leaders cannot escape these charges.

How humiliating is the conduct of most clergymen before the rich and the powerful! What flattery, what cowardly silence, what impotence and lack of character! The rich man is courted by the Church. Dignities and offices are forced upon him and the Church considers itself honored by his acceptance, however harsh his daily conduct to his employes, however unjust he may be toward his subordinates, however sharp his business practices. His money shields and protects him. There are too many examples of this.

The Church obeys the caprice of the world's rulers without the twitching of an eyelid. It stood behind the English government with hands uplifted in prayer when in the interests of Mammon alone England disgraced her name by unchaining dreadful war in South Africa. And when the Russian czar sent up his prayer to God at the outbreak of the war with Japan, the Church prayed with him. The Church is in the hands of the worldly powers. It turns the gospel, which is a gospel for mankind, into a tool of policy for this or that country. It stands no longer

for eternal ends but for earthly policies. It is a national Church above all—a Swiss or German or French or Russian or English Church. And then, in the last instance, a Church of God!

The Church serves not God but Mammon. And do we wonder that the Social Democrats want nothing of such a Church? Should we not see in this a sign of their truth and vitality?

10.

Under the scepter of Mammon, the gospel has transformed itself into empty doctrine and system. If the main endeavor of the Church to-day is to hold fast to the established order of society, must not the truths of the gospel, which were spoken against Mammon and in the interests of the new world of God, shrink into mere pious words, with which a compliant Church seeks to legitimize its position in the world but does not bring spirit and life to the hearts of men? And has it not been true for a long while that the gospel serves the Church only as an excuse for an entirely different activity?

What does the Church in its security care for the real meaning of the gospel? Long since it turned that meaning into a harmless exercise of worship and it neither can nor will understand that the gospel is diametrically opposed to the spirit of this world.

So the Church is very zealous with the expenditure of all its logic and the art of its theological theories and practical charities to win for the gospel as large a place in the commercial world as it can and to ac-

commodate its truth to the apprehension of the "natural man," the commercial-minded man.

The consequence of this must be either that the contents of the gospel are no longer taken in earnest or that they are converted into a system of dogmas and theories, while fresh, new, progressive movements provoke no response but distrust. The spiritual power of the gospel, now that the Church has belied its own original purpose, is used only to keep people submissive; and thus, under the patronage of the Church, the paradox has actually come to pass that a power which was destined above all to bring about the downfall of the existing order has been turned into its chief defense, and that the gospel of the Kingdom of God has become the strongest bulwark against that kingdom—the good news of the living God has become the indispensable ally of his enemy Mammon.

The Church has become reactionary because it no longer wills to advance. It cannot disappear in the general advance of civilizations, as some other institutions do; it has too much of its original truth left for that. It belongs at the head of the column of progress; and because it will not take its rightful place there, it hinders the march. This has been the great cause of reproach against the Church from early times.

As we have already said, the rôles have changed; what the Church should be doing in the fight against Mammon, the enemies of the Church are doing today—the Social Democrats. The Church no longer apprehends the living God; the Social Democrats do. But the Church *confesses* God, hence the Social

Democrats deny him. Because they will have nothing to do with empty words, theories and systems, but only with deeds, they have to deny the God who is presented to them only as the author of a pious dogma.

They see the Church which confesses God serving Mammon. They will have nothing to do with such a God *because* they will have nothing to do with Mammon. The time will come when their "atheism" will prove to have been the hidden confession of the living God.

II.

Conservative Christianity, the chief reliance of every Church, and the Social Democracy stand diametrically opposed to each other. And between them stands a Christianity which seeks to take the "practical" in each and to bring them together in a renewal of the life of society—this is the Christian Social Reform movement. The Christian Social Reformers break away from the more offensive dogmatic and ethical points of conservative Christianity and approach as nearly as they may to the Social Democratic position—an impossible compromise which will only lead to their being crushed out between the millstones of the two parties.

What has been the net result of the loyal and ardent work of a Naumann? Practically nothing. The Christian Social Reformers have accomplished nothing, and to-day they have nothing but a bare hope of a future victory—a deceitful hope, like all those that spring from despair. Why?

The Christian Social Reformers do not know what

is at stake in the social question. They see in it only a symptom of dissatisfaction arising from the denial of just and pressing demands, a dissatisfaction which Christianity has to reason with, and which can be removed by rational and practicable reinterpretation of gospel maxims. They quite overlook the divine element in the Social Democracy.

"What constitutes the chief fault of the Social Democracy?" says Naumann. "This, that it is doctrinaire in character, a system of universal claims. The Social Democracy is a posthumous child of Hegel, an offspring of the absolutist philosophy. As such it knows nothing of the living God, or of the living peo ple. In the place of God it has put the development of machinery, in the place of the people the proletariat —two conceptions in the place of two life powers. * * * * The Social Democracy is hard and thin in spirit. In spite of all its flourishing of the red, it is pale and wan. * * * It feeds the people with theories of political economy, that is with dogmas. But dogmas come and go; no system is eternal. And when this theory or that has passed, the heart of man will still be the same, and will thirst for its God. And the ancient longings of the human soul will not be stifled by big words—organization, production and consumption; and the poor rationalism of the Social Democracy cannot understand how, after thirty years of its agitation, there are still human hearts that regard God as something more than a priest's hoax. We have to take up the economic question just at the point where the Social Democrats leave it. They theorize, we must do the work; they are always

intent on society as a whole, we must think of the groups which compose this society, the unemployed, the day laborer, the factory worker, the farmer, the artisan, the merchant, the clerk. The new world-view whose dawn is even now breaking upon us must contain both economic and religious traits, and these traits must be in harmonious agreement." (*What is Christian Social Reform?* Vol. I, p. 5, 6.)

We maintain that nearly every word of this exposition is false. In proof let us take the sayings, "The Social Democrats theorize;" "they are always intent on society as a whole." But, allowing the statements as correct on the surface, Naumann entirely forgets the great motive force behind this theorizing. To stigmatize a great movement such as the Social Democracy, which, like the waves of the ocean, is assaulting every hitherto intact shore, with such terms as theorizing barrenness, doctrinaire futility, or Hegelian metaphysics, is a doubly astonishing error in a man so free from prejudices as Naumann. But Naumann here shuts his eyes to a great fact in order not to bring his own party into disrepute. He will not listen to the protestation—made as it is a thousand times by the Social Democrats themselves—that the theorizing, the system, the philosophy, all this is only a secondary matter in the Social Democracy.

It is true that Marx developed a theory of economic conditions and of the progress of human society on the lines of the Hegelian philosophy; if he spoke of the dialectic process which logically led to the conversion of private production into social production, it is not to these uncertain theories that the

Social Democratic movement owes its existence, but rather contrariwise: because ideas of social production and the like had long been fermenting in men's minds. Marx was captivated by them and tried to incorporate them in a logical completeness into an economic philosophic system. How little the younger groups of Social Democrats hold to this system Naumann himself has had ample opportunity to see in the recent opposition to Marx in the Social Democratic party. Think, for example, of the publications of Bernstein, or of books like David's *Land Husbandry and the Social Democracy,* a book in which Marx's theories are quite set aside, and in their place postulates are stated with which Naumann's party could agree in nearly every point. To be sure, David's book had not appeared at the time Naumann wrote the passage we have just quoted, but even then it was clear enough that the "system" or "philosophy" of the Social Democracy was only a concomitant and not the heart of the matter. Naumann did not want to see this, because he wanted to safeguard *his* position as over against the Social Democracy,the position which he defines in the words following: "*We* must think of the groups which compose this society, the unemployed, the day laborer, the factory worker, the farmer, the artisan, the merchant, the clerk."

We now ask: Is this limitation of one's efforts to the immediate, pressing social tasks, this work for the individual, which Naumann claims as the virtuous mark of his party, really a different aim from that of the Social Democracy? Do the great ends which the

latter pursues exclude or include the smaller ends of temporary help?*

And if the most extreme champions of the Social Democracy, like Kautsky, for example, maintain today that there is danger that the work of detail may distract the attention of the party from the great ends to be accomplished, this does not mean that the Social Democrats absolutely refuse to undertake such immediate aid. It is but the warning not to lose sight of the great ideal through too concentrated attention on matters of present detail. Indeed, I have not seen a single phrase in the whole literature of the Social Democracy in which the immediate work of detail is condemned in and of itself, apart, that is, from its relation to the great ends of the party. Whoever devotes himself to such cases, provided he keeps in sight the great aims of the party as well, is welcome in the Social Democratic camp—even if he cherishes a philosophy which differs in many points from the "theories" of the Social Democracy. So the antithesis which Naumann invents—on the one side hard, barren logic-mongering, on the other side the practical recognition of immediate and pressing tasks—is inconsiderate, false, unjust. But Naumann has an interest to serve in phrasing the matter as he does, and this leads us a step farther.

12.

Naumann gives his Christian Social Reform party, or, as he calls it later in opposition to Stoecker's conser-

*The great ends include the temporary help. See last paragraph but one of the Preface by the American Editor.

vatism, his National Social Reform party, a distinctly Christian basis. In the name of Christianity he combats determinedly, even if not harshly, the atheism of the Social Democrats. Inspired with a joyful optimism he sees the triumph of Christian Social Reform approaching: "We feel," says he, "that it is not we who possess the Christian Social idea; it is the Christian Social idea that possesses us. It compels us, it lifts us, it bears us on. It makes us put forth all our efforts, and it fills us with the intensest emotions. It masters us as both power and grace. We are forced to feel that God is working within us, as He worked in the prophets of the Old Testament. The inward impulse, sure of itself, must be there when any great work is to be accomplished. It is our task to find the notes to the spring song which fills our soul."

To be sure, he confesses that the immediate future is for the Social Democracy: "The Christian Social era will come only after the epoch of the Social Democracy." But still it will come with certain and irresistible march. "As the Social Democracy has inherited all that liberalism has won, so will the Christian Social movement inherit all that the Social Democracy shall win." (*What is Christian Social Reform?* Vol. I, p. 2, 3.)

This approaching form of Christianity is depicted on the model of patch-work. Naumann says: "Jesus is the source of bodily well-being, his spirit is a stream of healthful will. He appeared as a light for the poor who sat in darkness; and where he stretches forth his hand the human race is cured. Soul and body alike find healing in this divine source. This

Jesus, whom the first three Evangelists describe, this real Jesus in word and deed, will be discovered by the people when they have awakened from the sleep of materialism. We must keep him in the clear light until the day of the people's awakening; that is the duty of us Social Christians. * * * It is not theories that we want, but life. Even in religion we will leave dogmas to the expert theologian and ourselves live with Jesus. Our religion shall be to hold the same attitude toward poor and rich, toward master and servant, toward righteous and wicked, toward sound and sick, toward time and eternity, toward God and the world, as Jesus did. Jesus placed himself on a level with the lowliest of his brethren. He knows of but one question to be asked at the last judgment: Have ye fed the hungry, given the thirsty to drink, clothed the naked, sheltered the homeless, cared for the sick, visited those that are in prison? They who have not done these things have not served Christ, and they belong in the everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels. Behold the basis of Christian work for the people! *We must learn to look at everything from the point of view of the hungry.* No heart can cling to its possessions and be saved. Gold can never be the standard of value of a man."

"But," says Naumann further, "Jesus is not a communist. He has no idea of taking from the fishermen of Galilee the ownership of their boats and houses. He only forbids the superfluity of possessions, and teaches that all possessions belong to God and are only entrusted to men for their use. Jesus would have need, suffering and sin lessened. There-

fore, his miracles and his alms. We have to use different means from these, but our object is the same. That object is the constant aim of Christianity. The earth must be warmed through the warmth of heaven, and one source of distress and misery after another must vanish." (Ibid, pp. 8, 9, 10.)

These are, to be sure, high and noble thoughts. It is an excellent estimate of Christianity, but it deals only with detail and specific cases. There is something lacking in Naumann's program, namely, an integrating principle of orientation, a fundamental unity. The end of the gospel itself is lacking—in a word, the divine, the absolute. In the eyes of Naumann, Jesus is always and forever the opposite of misery. He is only helper, savior, deliverer from firmly settled evil, in a world which through his leadership is only approaching, never fully realizing completeness. He "would have need, suffering and sin lessened."

But that is not the whole Jesus as the gospels give him to us. It is not just to bring into relief only this alleviative social phase of his nature and to leave the other social phase as a mere decorative attribute. When Naumann says that Jesus used miracles in the accomplishment of what he came to do, but that we "have to use different means," this is only a too comfortable way of hiding the difficulties, of concealing the great discrepancy between Jesus' steadfastness and the weakness of will of the modern Church. This treatment leads to contradictions, too, in Naumann's scheme. For example, compare this feeble sentiment with his former statement that we must keep this Jesus of the first three gospels, this real Jesus, with

all he said and did (surely including miracles), "in the clear light until the day of the people's awakening."

But all this is only a secondary consideration. *The great lack in Naumann's Christianity is its complete unmindfulness of the apocalyptic element in the appearance of Jesus, and its attempt to fit Jesus permanently into a world to which He stood in the sharpest opposition.* Naumann does not grasp the contradiction between Jesus and this world in its deep significance. That is why he cannot work outspokenly for the overthrow of Mammon.

Naumann does not see that Mammon and the fashion of this world stand and fall together. He wishes to overthrow Mammon on the ground of Mammon itself, but that is a task as impossible as pulling oneself out of a pit by one's own hair. He believes in a gradual betterment of things, and does not see that the *new* must produce itself, that a new *world* must come.

Naumann does not understand Jesus. He regards the evil of this world as a great problem and summons the whole Jesus in order—to abate and lessen it! But to understand Jesus means to pay no regard to evil, to conquer it, to annihilate it in the strength of the living God. Jesus did not come to lessen the evil; on the contrary, where Jesus is there evil vanishes. Naumann always makes evil prior to Jesus. In reality Jesus is prior to evil. For in Jesus is the living God. Naumann does not dare to embrace this absolute view of Jesus. He speaks only of a "lessening" of the world's evil. He starts from this world to

arrive at Jesus; but Jesus came into this world from another. Naumann takes no heed of that other world.

13.

In Jesus the living God was revealed. This fact the Christian Social Reformers have not understood in its critical import. If God is worth anything, if His Kingdom is coming, how can we speak of sin, need, distress as of permanent forces that can only be modified? How can we be always mulling over social riddles, always so absorbed in all sorts of practical questions?

And above all, how can we make the Gospel, which is the announcement of the power of God, merely a new yoke-horse to the social car? The advent of the living God is still unknown to the Christian Social Reform party. Here lies, in a single word, its weakness.

The Christian Social Reformers have one distinct advantage over the conservatives—they urge a working, living Christianity. But because they have not grasped the full meaning of such a Christianity it has shrunk in their hands to a mere social remedy which embellishes itself with the name *Christian*, but does not know the substance. Therefore their labor is in danger constantly of sinking into the sand of well-meaning phrases and inoffensive ameliorations. It is in danger of stopping progress. As Calwer said of it in his pamphlet on "The Church in the Service of the Promoter," it hinders the progress of trade-unionism by splitting up the working class. Such is in fact the net result of its "practical" activity.

On the other hand, the conservatives have an indisputable truth on their side. They understand the supernatural significance of Jesus. They, at least in theory, recognize the antithesis, heaven and earth, time and eternity, God and Mammon. That they keep these opposing realities far asunder, and refuse to see how God's kingdom opens its way across the events of the world—this is their grievous fault; and it condemns them to rigidity, to the formalism of dogma and ceremonial.

But when the conservatives once wake from their slumber they will maintain these great, concise principles of antithesis, and will no longer deny the Social Democrats their divine justification. Then the Christian Social Reformers will disappear from sight.

Each of the two parties represents a part of the truth, but both fail of the chief element of truth, namely, *the knowledge of the living God in the social problem.* One side says: "The kingdom of God is still impossible on earth. When Jesus comes again He will overthrow Satan and make a new world out of the old." The other side says: "We must not fix our view on the impossible. God's Kingdom is coming progressively. We must seize the practicable and not disturb ourselves over the rest." One side holds to a radical renewal—but postpones it till the end of the world. The other side hopes for a gradual change of conditions, and foregoes the outlook on the future. The former have an apocalyptic theory—and for just that reason they are embarrassed, half-hearted, lame and weak in the present. The latter will hear nothing of an apocalypse, so that they may

have free field for their present efforts. Both are hostile to the Social Democracy—the former call it godless; the latter impractical. Both are too blinded by their prejudices to see in it the hand of God.

In reality God is working neither in the conservatives nor in the Christian Social Reformers, but in the Social Democrats. The Social Democrats alone understand that a new world must come. They are as active as the Christian Social Reformers, as idealistic as the conservatives. They are not contented with mere "betterment," they look to a great new future. They combine the features parallel with those of both the Christian parties—faith and works, prophecy and practice. They talk of the "impossible" and at the same time accomplish the possible. They dream of an all-embracing Brotherhood and at the same time care for the immediate help of the poor. They are dreamers and fanatics in the eyes of men, and yet accomplish what none of the sane have done. They are ridiculed and insulted for their fanaticism, yet feared for their activity. They are irresistible. They alone are living, forceful, sound. They have the living God!

Not in pious formula and ceremony—they do not pray to Him; nay! they deny Him. But they have Him in fact. And Jesus acknowledges as his not those who say, "Lord, Lord!" but those who do the will of God.

They do that will. They resist Mammon and preach a new world of love for all men. They halt not at the "impossibilities" which men raise; they care not for limits. They know that the old order

must fall. They "believe all things, hope all things, endure all things." This is their divine mark and seal.

CHAPTER IV.

"THE SOCIAL DEMOCRACY IS A REVOLUTIONARY PARTY— IT ATTEMPTS TO GAIN SUPREME CONTROL THROUGH THE OVERTHROW OF ALL EXISTING CONDITIONS."

I.

Such is one of the complaints against the Social Democracy. "All violence is unwholesome. Revolutions have never compassed their ends. The march of historic evolution abhors arbitrary attempts at hastening its processes, and allows no violent hand to interfere in its development. It accomplishes the stages of evolution quietly and uniformly."

On the contrary it is remarkable how the very revolutionary forces in the world's history, how just the powers that have stood in sharpest opposition to the environing conditions, have made the way for progress. Evolution has always consisted in the carrying out of a revolutionary program on one hand, and on the other hand the preparation for a new revolution. It moves always between the poles of two revolutions, whose full truth it distributes in a harmonious historical development. Evolution, in the sense of a constant uninterrupted process, does not exist either in the historical or in the scientific world. It is not historically true that a civilization comes out of simple beginnings by a gradual, quiet, uninterrupted process of growth. New factors burst out from hid-

den sources, unrecognized, uncomprehended; they often turn the development of history into utterly new paths.

There are absolute powers in the course of history. And these powers are those which have to bear the reproach of revolution. There are powers which cannot be classified in the scheme of evolution, which mock the false science that knows of evolution alone.

Men do not wish to hear of eternal powers. But history, which is both made and re-made by these eternal powers, bears witness to them. We need not imagine to ourselves any distant, foreign world in order to comprehend these powers. They reveal themselves in the course of events; they show through all the words that we speak, they can be understood every moment. And whenever they are rightly understood and grasped, then comes a crisis in the world's history.

Revolutions in the real sense of the word are the uprising of the world-Vulcan. For centuries he sleeps beside the eternal, undisturbed, indifferent; then in a moment he wakes, grasps the truth, and holds it fast. Then a new era dawns, a revelation has come!

The Eternal, the Absolute must be! The everlasting demands cannot be denied, cannot be bargained away; they must be fulfilled! The temporal, on the other hand, may constitute itself in various forms; it is alterable and capricious. The tremendous consequences that have come to the history of the Christian centuries are due to flashes of light from the eternal world, to the eternal powers working and

creating. With passionate unrest and pain our civilization moves forward, driven by the pulse-beat of eternity.

And precisely because we Christians profess to be in league with eternal, absolute powers, does progress attach to the name of Christianity. It is in a certain sense true that Christianity is hostile to civilization. It is true in the sense that after once accepting Christianity men could never again be satisfied with the egoistic, complacent civilization of the old Greek world. The spirit of Christianity drives men from one level of civilization to the next, mercilessly sacrificing everything that stands in the way of the development of moral perfection. It is not content with any state of affairs that simply leaves men in calm and prosperity. It carries an irresistible *must* in itself, which sacrifices if necessary the finest products of human culture. It makes them all of no account. It concerns itself not mainly with the momentary happiness of mankind. It has only one passionate demand; to create forms for the truth which *must* be.

If we had not the *must* of Christianity we should stand still. We should sink into lazy quiet and slow degeneration. Its absolute demands keep us sound. A proof of how futile it is to try to banish the eternal out of history; a proof that man is only man when he is busy with the eternal.

2.

The decisive revolutions of the world's history are: the prophecy of Israel, the advent of Jesus, the Refor-

mation, the French Revolution, and the Social Democracy.

All these movements have the characteristics of eternal powers which we have just discussed; they all demand the eternal, the lasting, in the midst of the passing. They all set themselves in stiffest opposition to their time and thus inaugurate a new era. They all have a force in them which will not abide question, an imperative which hardly realizes itself, but which will and must create that to which it impels. *They must!* And all that the following age does to explain this "must" in wise terms of human philosophy is no explanation. The dogmatic of Christianity is altogether a secondary matter to the faith; the deep philosophical systems of Protestantism are not its strength; the metaphysics of Marx do not define Social Democracy. It has ever been the effort of men to make every new revelation conform to their powers of philosophic expression, but the effort has never been crowned with success, and has often been attended with calamity.

It is blindness to blame the Social Democracy for being revolutionary; for it *must* be revolutionary if it is to fulfil its mission. What fulfils its mission must always be revolutionary for the environment—whether the revolution be accomplished with words, with cannon or with votes.

It is of a piece with the superficiality, with the lack of character of our modern society that it criticizes the externals of the Social Democracy, and withal entirely fails to grasp its meaning, and so thinks it can laugh the movement to scorn.

What is meant when Stoecker cries: "The Social Democracy is revolutionary, violent; it courses with the storm-wind; its sails are red; its ocean is blood"? What do such words prove?

It is said that the Social Democracy itself confesses, or at least did once confess, its character of violence. For example, the Communist Manifesto contained these words: "The Communists everywhere support every revolution against the existing social and political order." "They are above hiding their aims and their views. They declare openly that their ends can be reached only by the violent overthrow of the present order of society." In the same manner speaks Bebel in his work, *Our Aims:* "Let no one be shocked at this possible use of violence or fume over the suppression by force of privileges previously authorized by society. All history teaches us that new ideas generally come to fruition through the forceful struggle of their champions with the defenders of the established order, and that these champions seek to strike at the old order a fatal blow. So we see how force has played its telling part in many epochs of the world. Karl Marx was not speaking at random when he said: 'Violence is the midwife of every society pregnant with a new idea.'" Wherever we look in the traditional literature of the Social Democracy, say these critics, we find the same idea recurring. The fact that in recent years the tone is growing more pacific, that a Bernstein, for example, disavows explicitly the violent methods of his party, does not prove anything to the critics. For on the one hand, they say, it is impossible to tell how far this new

mildness is only a mask assumed by some of the Social Democrats for the accomplishment of immediate ends, and on the other hand there are still plenty of Social Democrats who insist on force for the realization of the new social conditions. The Social Democracy is and remains at base a revolutionary movement. Stoecker's reproach at the inception of the party is still true to-day; therefore it is the duty of every Christian to combat the godless, revolutionary Social Democracy as best he can. For violence is not of God. God abhors and punishes it with righteous punishment. Thus hold the religious condemners of the Social Democracy.

3.

To this Christian anxiety we have the following reply to make: If you open the New Testament you will find on every page—Revolution. The violent end of the old world is its theme. Everything that Jesus says pertains to a new world. Even his sweetest, softest words can be comprehended only in the light of the new world which is coming.

When he bids us be free from care as the children and the sparrows, trusting for our nourishment to our heavenly Father's hand; when he forbids us to gather treasures on earth, he strikes the entire prevailing conception of life a blow in the face, and condemns our system of production more strongly than the reddest Socialist. And if Jesus' words are true, if they are not the wandering words of a misty intellect, of an overstrained fancy, of a warm emotional devotion; if they are words of soberness and reality,

then must they not revolutionize our whole existing society? Will their fulfillment come without violence?

Will the servants of Mammon and the gatherers of treasures, all the army of men pledged to the rule of Mammon, let the change come in peace? Did not Jesus himself see the inevitable conflict when he said: "I am come not to bring peace, but the sword"? Where have we any warrant in the New Testament for the idea of our sentimental Christianity that all this renewal of earth is to consist in the sweet, soft breath of emotional contemplation? Where is it written that everything is to proceed from the heart through the change of heart, and that outward force is godless?

Yes, godless, when measured by the frail creation of our cowardly Christianity, the fantastic idol that we have set in the place of the living God—the impotent, false god whose providence never extends to the sphere of natural forces, whose will is only the shield with which we cover our hypocrisy and weakness, through whose authority we legitimize all baseness, from whom we expect good only in the future, while the suspicion that the real God lives and works in the present as in the past is set down as a blasphemy!

But the living God laughs at this bastard, fearful Christianity. He says to a people: Sink and become dust—and the power of destruction rises over that people, death swings his lurid torch over blooming fields and fruitful meadows. Then unavailing are moaning, shrieking and entreaty. Like a swarm of locusts the powers of death ravage the land—and who will withstand them? Who will say, This is terrible, it is godless? What cares the living God for our mo-

mentary suffering? He has fields and meadows, leaping brooks and blue lakes enough. He has inexhaustible treasures, and need not regret it when the grass withers and the flowers fade, when houses fall in ruins and cities collapse. His purpose is to rouse men from false security, to deliver them from evil pleasures and idle frivolities and to lead them to their everlasting destiny.

The living God *needs* violence. In the vicissitudes of change and loss we are made wise. The pavilions of our momentary delights we build and rebuild, and God shatters them above our heads!

Is He to be forever a spectator, watching us ruin ourselves in our frivolity, listening to the talk of our science, the chirping of our wisdom? If He lives and works, must He not tear from our hands every useless plaything, that He may fill them with the eternal riches?

Yes, there is no greater danger for our littleness than the living God, nothing more destructive to our vanity than that He is.

The greatest of all revolutionists is the living God. He is the most ruthless of destroyers! For our age too He is preparing surprises which will ring in the ears of the people. Like chaff will He sweep away the cowardly embarrassments and misgivings of our Christianity and in the storm wind of His judgment will He rouse us to the real greatness which we in our vanity would fritter away, but which He in spite of all will keep safe for the children of men.

4.

At present we are petty and common. We mix

the service of God and the service of Mammon. We *say* "God!" but the breath of Mammon sweeps our word away. The dust impresses us; nothingness compels our worship. We have no longer the power to imagine a great endless universe, and ourselves as the members of an order that is more permanent than the objective facts that our minds can grasp. To be sure we acknowledge mechanically that the earth is but a grain of dust. Yet we cling to that grain of dust and have no power to grasp the great eternity which palpitates in every breath we draw.

We are small. Everything inspires us with fear, keeps us down, plunges us in anxious cares. We are small in our fears, small in our hopes. Great is the little child that trusts its father, great the birds that have the whole earth for their granary—but we are little. We build chests and boxes, castles, vaults to hide our treasures. We fortify them with walls and cannon. We play hide-and-seek in the great open world of God; alas, there is for us no great world.

Our social life is petty; our standpoints, theories, systems, our science and art, our heaven and hell, our Christianity—everything—everything little and earth-stained.

Only one thing is great; Mammon; Mammon ever rearing his strong head of gold like a giant phantom over our civilization.

Then the storm wind of God blows through the dry leaves of our civilization—the voice of the Social Democracy!

God cares not where he finds his servants. The invited refused his call to do his work, therefore he

reached forth for the "atheists"—and they have responded. He must go on with the work. Righteousness, love, fraternity must dominate. And when righteousness arises, the dust of vanity that has lain upon it must be shaken off. The strongest mountain must tremble and break asunder when Vulcan stirs himself. And the Vulcan of eternity is working now! Ominous rumblings can be heard. Seething masses are in motion. The fire of eternity is bursting forth, and the mountain of Mammon will be rent asunder.

The world says in its fear: Behold the covetousness of the masses, the execrable discontent of the proletariat, behold revolution and ruin! But through such cries of fear is heard the voice of the living God: "I rouse Myself to deliver My imprisoned people. I will lead them to the brooks of water where they may quench their thirst; I will wipe away the dust-stains from their brow, and take from their limbs the fetters of Mammon. I will wait no longer. My justice is outraged, My patience exhausted. I will smite them that have smitten My poor. I will show My power to them that have used power against My little ones. For I am the Lord!" That is revolution, but in the revolution is God.

5.

It is your fault that it is so. You will have revolution because you will not forsake Mammon. You ridicule the Eternal Love proclaimed to you. You declare that as things are now so they have always been and so they will ever be. You provoke the revolution, because you exhaust the patience of the Most High with your oppressions.

Oppressions! My pen fails me when I try to write them down. Wherever my eye turns, there is the pressure of the strong upon the weak—a system of ceaseless exploitation from top to bottom. Force and cunning in control everywhere. The earth has all that all men need—forests for weak lungs, river-banks for wearied limbs, sun, air, warmth for the millions who crave to live. But forest, water, air and light do the millions little good. They cannot enjoy these gifts of God. They are chained to the inexorable power of the machine, to the cruel power of the owner. There is no escape, no hope for betterment, no relief.

Wherever Mammon has claimed a human heart, there is hell on earth. Nothing is conceded but what must be conceded. The simplest and most obvious claims of humanity are ruthlessly trodden under foot. Children and frail women are sacrificed to the golden Moloch. Nothing is sacred, the bonds of shame are loosed, and man sinks to a level with the beast.

A shudder of horror ran through the civilized world when Marx, the great champion of the poor, set the wretchedness of the English factory population before the eyes of a blasé world. Read the descriptions of Engels or any other of the writers on social conditions, of any party, realize the desperation of so many poorest of the poor, the bondage and slavery of all the hundreds of thousands that are languishing in Mammon's bonds, the brutal and unscrupulous indifference with which in the flower of their life men are thrown into the abyss through the cruel folly of our system of production, the deeds of violence daily perpetrated on our poor—and then ask yourself what weight has

the complaint against the Social Democracy that it is revolutionary!

Is there a more revolting piece of hypocrisy in the world than this cry? And if the Social Democracy were a hundred times as violent as you in your sin-bred terror imagine it, even then it would be a blessing in comparison with the daily deeds of violence which you are practicing against your poorer brethren.

Society has no right to complain of revolution. Such a censure in its mouth is unsupportable hypocrisy. Men extort from the poor, and then cry "revolution," when the poor try to cast off the yoke of oppression.

Is it God's will that the lowly should bow themselves to the dust? Why may not by chance the opposite be His will! When it is a question of protecting riches, privileges, responsibilities, rank, prerogatives of every kind, then men talk of God as the Power who has arranged and established all that; but if it is a question of the rights of the downtrodden, then they talk of hell, of satanic envy and covetousness. They believe in God—to protect Mammon, and in Satan—to discipline the masses. The injustice of the rich is justice; the right of the poor is wrong.

The poor dare not stir. They have their comfort for privation—in heaven. If they raise their heads or rattle their chains, then society trains cannon on them and prays in its churches against the spirit of revolt and hell. With what right, tell me if you can?

Why should not the poor man live? Why not as well as you lead a life free from care? Why must he eke out his days in misery and mortification? Because you would not then be able to receive so large divi-

dends or build houses so fine; or else because his cry strikes so unpleasantly on your ears.

But did not the same God to whom you pray weekly that he may preserve your property also create the poor man? And do you dare speak of the will of God when the poor man sinks under your heavy hand?

If suffering is God's will, if you have no other comfort for the poor man's misery but that it is good for him to cultivate submission and patience, why then do you cry out against the dangers that threaten you, why talk of revolution and violence when your thrones totter? Does not your Bible say: "With what judgment ye judge ye shall be judged and with what measure ye mete it shall be meted to you"? If it is right for you to oppress the poor, tell me why it is not right for the poor to defend themselves against you?

6.

Calmly you regard the misery of the masses, you do not shudder at the despairing cry of the unfortunate. Your brow is hard as steel, your heart is as rock. You are not sentimental dreamers; with cool, sober gaze you look out upon the foaming waters, called life. Man must learn to endure; without trouble and anxiety he becomes good for nothing—that is your maxim. And you are right. We are made to strive, and by strife to overcome. We should not fear evil nor retreat before danger. We should present a bold front to calamity, meet death intrepidly, bear without a tremor all the blows that life can give. But why does this truth change bitterly into falsehood as soon as there is peril to your privileges, your posi-

tion, your rank, your gold? Why do you glory in the storm of events so long as it rears its waves around the boats of the poor, but cry so loudly for help as soon as it touches your own fortune?

Is it true, as venal flatterers whisper in your ear, that you are men of a different blood from others—"super-men"? Is it true that God has determined on a diverse lot for men, decreeing happiness for the rich and suffering for the poor? Is it true that your industrial advantages give you a rightful monopoly of happiness?

I will tell you the truth; Mammon has blinded your hearts, darkened your intellects, broken your strength of soul. He has taken justice, truth and love from your hearts and planted there his own morals. For there is a special mammon-truth, a mammon-piety.

Mammon has his Ten Commandments as well as God, and them have you taken to heart: Ye shall have no other gods, no living God, but me. Ye shall make no useless conceptions and ideals for yourselves. Ye shall not honor what is in heaven or on earth. For, I, Mammon, am a strong god, visiting vengeance on children's children of those who neglect me, and rewarding my worshippers with prosperity and riches. Ye shall not speak slightingly of Mammon, for he that so doeth shall not go unpunished. Six days shalt thou do Mammon's business, and all the seventh think of him. Thou shalt honor Mammon that thou mayst live long and prosper, and that the securities which he puts into thy hand may rise in value. Ye shall not break your troth with Mammon. Ye shall steal as

much as ye safely can. Ye shall bring false witness and institute false practices against your neighbor, for such conduct is well pleasing to Mammon. Ye shall covet no other good but gold.

Know you not these commandments? Do you not see how different a world they make, how different life is in the light of their morals? We understand now why the rich consider themselves of so much greater value than the poor. They measure man by money. We comprehend now that God's grace rests upon the rich and his anger upon the poor. For "God" is Mammon and he knows no greater disgrace than poverty. We understand now how right is wrong and wrong is right, for Mammon's morals are different from the living God's.

It is even as Jesus said: "Ye cannot serve God and Mammon;" and you who serve Mammon are incapable of understanding the social question, because its very essence is the irreconcilable enmity between God and Mammon.

7.

In truth the Revolution-idea is born of Mammon; it is through Mammon that revolution has become a historic necessity. So long as money rules, there will be revolution. All that is said against revolutions comes from the fear that Mammon's rule will suffer.

The spirit of Mammon cares nothing for great thoughts stirring the minds of men; it cares for itself alone; it stands or falls with egoism. The world of egoistic production is its world. Mammon raises its throne wherever the most money is to be heaped together.

Since immense masses of money could not be heaped up if men's interests were common, Mammon strives to keep men apart, sever the bands of family, of tribe, of humankind. The peoples given over to the dominion of Mammon fall into congeries of atoms, bound by no inner union, only by the outer tie of cash. Ancient Rome perished under Mammon; the Papal Church was disrupted by Mammon; and it is Mammon who is leading the modern states to dissolution.

But in the midst of this domination of Mammon the living God is working. Mammon has its aims. God has His. Mammon will hear nothing of righteousness. God will hear of nothing else. Truth and love are foolishness in the judgment of Mammon, in God's judgment they are the power of life. On both sides an inalterable law; here the law of self, there the law of love. And when these laws meet on the same field, when they claim the same scene, who shall say that revolution must not come? Revolution is necessary, because the Kingdom of God is necessary. Destruction must come, because the eternal must be established. The world does not follow quietly its own laws of development; in the midst of its life rules the living God!

Simply imagine men free from the passionate fear for their worldly possessions, hence free to be possessed by a higher conception of life, free therefore to deal with their property according to that higher conception—would men so made free not at once put an end to crises and to poverty? But as long as men eagerly cling to earthly possessions, unconscious of a

higher world, as long as they see their sole help and power in money, gold their sole reality, so long will it be needful that the living God set His reality against Mammon's appearance of reality, that so God may tear men from their treasure-boxes, from the dark vaults where their stores lie, up into the light of His truth. Not otherwise can men be set free from the delusions of Mammon; and thus is God to-day working through the Social Democracy. Society cries "revolution"; but this word is but the screen for society's evil conscience.

8.

But you say: "We, too, acknowledge the right of revolution; we, too, believe that the eternal verities cannot make their way by any other means. We have the example of our Lord himself in his assault upon the priests and the Pharisees; we have the example of the Reformers who defied the whole world unterrified. But the power that Jesus and the Reformers used was the power of inward conviction, not that of outward and brutal violence. 'He who draws the sword shall perish by the sword,' says Jesus. 'The word alone must accomplish it,' was the motto of Luther. Not at all such is the program of the Social Democracy, which (at least in its beginning) openly made violence and bloodshed its basis and declared that its demands could never be realized without resort to arms. And its tactics of constraining society to yield, by means of strikes more and more extensive, are little calculated to induce confidence in its peaceful intentions."

In answer to this reproach we will not insist on the clear assertion of the modern Social Democracy

that it abhors physical force and would reach its ends purely by ways of peace; we will not dwell on the fact that the demonstrations and manifestoes of the Social Democrats have often been distinguished for their express characteristics of calmness and good sense. We will grant, for the moment, that the Social Democracy is convinced that it can arrive at its ideals only through the intervention of outward force. What does that prove?

The Social Democrats say: We can expect victory only through a revolution by force. Does this mean that they are violent men, that they pretend to want a social change but really want blood? No man, not even their bitterest enemy, is fool enough to believe such a charge. Everyone concedes, whether grudgingly or gladly, that the Social Democrats cultivate a noble idealism. "If the Social Democracy rage against the powerfully protected worship of Mammon, there is in their rage a lofty idealism." (Schall: *The Social Democracy, Its Truth and Its Errors,* p. 175.) "A spirit of noble endeavor, an idealism which often shames the well-to-do classes, a devotion approaching martyrdom characterizes many an agitator of the Social Democracy." (Schaeffle: *The Futility of the Social Democracy,* p. 38.) Even Stoecker says, "A movement which takes such deep hold, which in so short a time wins great masses of men and women, a movement so strong and so lasting that it has been necessary to counteract it by the passage of laws which contradict the modern spirit of liberty—such a movement is not a product of lazy minds nor is it a turn of

chance, or a child of folly." (*Christian Social Reform,* 2d edition, p. 216.)

But if its idealism is the prominent trait of the Social Democracy, then its doctrine of the violent upheaval of society cannot be looked on as a thing believed because desired. The Social Democrats have determined that the rule of Mammon shall fall. But Mammon has his kingdom in the things in sight, in the circumstances and the whole life-activities of men. If Mammon is to fall, all these outward circumstances must be changed. It is not a question here of theories, systems, thoughts alone, (as it was largely, for example, in the Reformation), but of the establishment, continuance or disappearance of what men of all classes or ranks regard as their primary interests. The chief question of life—the stomach question—must at last be solved, freed from the awful confusion into which it has been brought by the dominion of Mammon, and settled so that men may never have to recur to it.

The material foundation of our life must be definitely laid and assured. This is a postulate of the most decisive importance. It is clear that society is struck by this demand as by no other and that the servants of Mammon will defend themselves to the last against granting this demand. Here we have Mammon touched at the point of deepest interest, struck at its roots.

9.

So then it seems that the social question cannot be solved except by violence. But whose fault is that? Consider the way in which great and small, learned

and ignorant, conservative and liberal, all society, with the church at the head, have treated the Social Democrats for the past decades. Remember the scorn and despite which has been their lot, the ridicule with which they have always been greeted, the suspicions scattered broadcast to their harm. Think of the readiness with which the police have been on hand to quell the slightest sign of Social Democratic "disturbance," of the annoyances and persecutions to which the leaders have been subjected, of the scorn which society has poured upon their idealism. Would not the Social Democrats have to be made of different stuff, from ourselves, would they not have to be angels and seraphim rather than men, to meet this base treatment of society with the sweet smile of unassailable, joyous optimism?

They aim at something grand and eternal—society derides them. They have high and pure purposes—society suspicions them. They make the greatest sacrifices for their idealism—society accuses them of materialism and of pleasure-seeking. They rise against the arch-enemy of humanity—society screams, "Revolution, subversion!"

We are agreed that it is absolutely wrong for men to make the forcible overthrow of all existing conditions the principle of their faith, but we say that neither Church nor society has the right to accuse the Social Democrats of harboring this principle. And we further assert that the Social Democracy has repeatedly shown itself and is more and more clearly showing itself to be a party (we say unqualifiedly, the *greatest* party) of peace. There is to-day no better pledge of domestic peace than the existence of the

Social Democratic party. The wider this party spreads, the quieter our life will be. The shocking state of the factory worker has yielded, thanks to the party's activity, to a somewhat more humane order. Mobs of desperate, hungry workers no longer assemble to threaten their masters; all this has given way to a settled system of tactics, conscious of aim.

It is foolish to blame strikers. We may see in strikes a dangerous and deplorable procedure, but we must not forget that this procedure is necessary, on the one hand in order to secure a discipline of the masses which will save them from riotous uprisings, and on the other hand, to keep the minds of the workers alive to the great conflict of classes.

This conflict of classes is provoked not by the workers but by Mammon. He who opposes strikes as unjust or sinful either does not know that this class-struggle existed, and in a much rougher, more dangerous form than now, long before strikes were organized, or else he is content to let the antagonism of the classes with all its terrible potentialities go quietly on while he condemns all show of strife. The former assumption shows hardly pardonable ignorance, the latter shows brutality. The conflict of the classes exists. It began as soon a there were oppressors and oppressed. That the Social Democracy has brought this conflict to clear light and systematized its meanings is a great service, a service which deserves least of all to be branded by the name of revolutionary tactics. For the workers to abandon the class-struggle would mean nothing else than that they should fall back under the old tyranny of Mammon.

For Mammon never yields willingly. He gives in—when he *must*.

It is an astonishing thing that any should presume to condemn strikes in the name of Christianity. Why, it is Christianity itself that has given us the struggle between two great principles, made us able to follow opposite principles to the very end and decide bravely for one or the other. This is what we call character, love of truth.

But, when it is a question of the Social Democracy, how differently people judge. Here they refuse to see the opposition of principles. How foolish! In questions of religious theory, where the principles concern only the realm of ideas, where they can be reconciled by reciprocal good will, where they do not touch the dearest interests of men, their irreducible opposition is held to with a fixed *non possumus*—we cannot yield. But where the opposing principles mean real disaster, where they are of the most vital importance, where the fight between giants, God and Mammon, is to be fought—in the economic field—there men deny the conflict, refuse to hear of irreconcilable principles, and think they can smooth over the enmity with well-meaning words and Christian texts. How short-sighted, how unjust to the great matter in hand!

10.

We are obliged to blame the Christian Social Reformers for having, by their attitude toward strikes, hurt the position of the worker and so helped the reaction. They cannot see the opposition of principles clearly. They regard the present system of produc-

tion as on the whole justifiable, and think it is only the hearts of men that are wrong. They hide the real evil behind Christian commonplaces. So they think they can break up the question, and deal with each case in detail. They do not see *the strike* as a principle, but only many strikes, each different from the other. And the way in which they deal with them is ominous.

They say: "We have to find out simply whether the strike in question is a just one or not. In case it is not, we must take sides against the strikers, for we stand for justice above all else." That is a method of procedure utterly false. It is not only futile and ineffective; it is positively unjust. For it ignores the iniquitous social status out of which strikes develop, to fix attention on the momentary issue between the employed and the employer. To be sure, in many instances workmen plunge into a strike without sufficient cause; but such instances are more than balanced by the "black lists" and other injurious acts of the magnates. Anyone who attempts the complete casuistry of this business is undertaking the task of Sisyphus. The occasional attitude of employed toward employer is of little consequence, the basal attitude is everything.

What would be thought, for example, in theological circles, of attempting to get at the difference between the Catholic and the Protestant Church by appeal to case after case of doctrine and of morals? This was attempted soon after the break between the churches, but in vain. It was soon discovered that the difference was a basal one, not to be smoothed over by arbi-

tration on special cases. Why do not our social thinkers profit by this example? Why do some even say that the social question is not one of clashing principles, and that to take it as such is to confuse the issue wholly?

They say: "The social question cannot be condensed into a clear and unequivocal formula. There are too many individual interests involved: here the landlord, there the tenant; here the employer, there the worker. The structure of the social body is so complex that, unless we wish to fall into that barren doctrinaire speculation which characterizes the Social Democrats, we must take each case on its own merits, and attempt to solve it according to its peculiar conditions."

Such is in substance the thesis of the Christian Reformers. We have already seen that their Christianity is annexed to their social postulates, but neither penetrates them nor fecundates them with its spirit. They do not understand Christianity. If they did, they would see that it claims to be a basal matter and not merely a concomitant phenomenon. The living spirit of Christianity will not allow itself to serve as a mere ameliorating principle. It must *create anew*. It does not brood like a pitying angel over society, reaching down at times from above to appease and help and comfort—but within society it works out its great purposes. It is not a pious theory, any more than it is a scientific theory. It is closer to men than they think, in their hearts and thoughts. It is present before men speak of it; it works, completes its work, while they are still cudgel-

ling their brains for methods; it is not only a matter of the heart; it is spirit, truth and life, the victory of love over self, the power of the living God, who brings His purpose to pass with irresistible power.

II.

This spirit of Christianity is the only real power in world-history. It is the complete antithesis to the world. God and Mammon are absolute enemies on the ground of Christianity. Here life, there death; here love, there hate; here heaven, there hell. Christianity brings an eternal, indomitable *must* into the kingdom of Mammon. It says: Life, love, light *must* be!

"But for just that reason," say the conforming Christians, "Christianity cannot be the governing principle of the social question. Religion is divine, the social question is mundane. Love cannot be raised to a political maxim and written on the banners of a party. Love is not a thing which can be enforced. And the Social Democrats are the last persons in the world to pretend to fight for eternal love."

So they speak and know not what they say. They separate the divine from the human, the eternal from the earthly. With open eyes they refuse to see that God in Jesus Christ has *united* himself with men, and made divine love the governing principle of all earthly life.

This love seeks expression in the Social Democratic party—let the Social Democrats ridicule the idea as they will. They ridicule the idea because they have never known of any other kind of divine love than

that which appears in the Church's dogmatics; because the divine has always seemed to them mysticism and dreams. But they, themselves, are mystics and dreamers in the judgment of society. They speak (as did the Christians of old) of a better future, of a new life, of universal brotherhood, and such like "foolishness." To the great thoughts which master and possess them they cannot give any suitable expression. They have something too great for themselves to handle. It bursts their hearts. It makes them irresistible. It presses them forward. They *must!*

Consequently they are accused of being revolutionary innovators, and themselves, seeking words to express their great inspiration, come upon phrases which imply destruction of existing conditions. They feel convinced that society must be other than it is, the old order must go, and a new must come. But they abhor violence, they wish to persuade by pen and tongue. Then the impelling power of their faith becomes too strong for them to control. In terms of the current thought of society they are nurturing folly. Measured by the accepted standard of the present, they are aiming at madness. It is all a ferment and confusion which the conservative citizen shudders at. But in very truth it is the dawning of a new day. It is true that "nobody can *make* love a governing principle, or enforce it on men," that nobody can make revolutions for love—nobody but God.

God alone commits no sacrilege when He makes weak and sinful men the apostles of His Kingdom. The Social Democrats are revolutionary because God is revolutionary; they must go forward, because His

Kingdom must go forward; they are men of the overturning because God is the great overturner.

12.

"But the Social Democrats are immoderate in their language. They insult their opponents and rouse the people by a goad of bitter accusation. They have not found the right word."

Where *is* the word for their great desire; the liberating, kindling word? Why, O Church, dost thou not rise to give the Social Democracy its baptism of idealism? For to thee the Lord has given this word, the final decisive word for the poor against their oppressors, the word of deliverance for a groaning creation, the word of the living God, the word which alone has power to calm clamorous voices and to direct the raging passions of men toward the light of truth, the great complete word of God. This word, thou hast it, O Church! The Social Democrats do not have it. They strive and struggle, they rage and rave—the storm-wind is driving them. Give them the word! In the name of the living God, join their ranks, preach to them of eternal love; spare not, fear not, advance to meet Mammon in deadly strife. Then behold! the threatening waves of the Social Democracy which are dashing against the bulwarks of civilization will subside into the peaceful and fruitful streams that water the face of the earth. Say no longer, O Church, "This is of Hell and Destruction!" Say rather, "God wills it!" Then wilt thou ward off what gives us all dread—the revolution!

CHAPTER V.

"THE SOCIAL DEMOCRACY DOES NOT RECOGNIZE SIN."

Now comes another and often-heard objection against the Social Democracy. If any one denies sin, the truth is not in him. How then can the Church be the sponsor of a movement which does not recognize sin?

I.

The Social Democrats declare that what the Church teaches on the subject of sin is a mere dogma. There is no such thing as sin. All evil comes out of our bad economic conditions. Better the conditions and you will remove wickedness. "From the moment," says Engels, "when the private possession of movable things became a custom the moral commandment, Thou shalt not steal! came into force. Was such a commandment then an eternal moral law? By no means. In a society where the temptations to stealing were removed, where only the idiot would think of stealing, the moral teacher who should go about majestically proclaiming, Thou shalt not steal! would be laughed at." (*Diehring's Confusion of Science,* p. 89.) "It is a frightful injustice to declare that human nature was originally corrupt, tainted with sin, lost but for a revelation from Heaven." (Douai's *Answer to the Theists,* p. 15.) "Private ownership—that is the sin from which every injustice is born. It creates those frightful sufferings which tempt to evil, the fear for one's life which is reflected in sin. And

still private ownership was an historical necessity. As a transitive phase from the first naive communism of early agricultural people to the modern conscious, developed communism of the future society it was necessary, and in so far—good. It created modern civilization with its high intelligence and its enormous capacity for achievement. Without the lessons that men have drawn from its teaching they could not appreciate the problems of economics which confront us to-day. It has had its day, however. Private ownership is an evil to-day, because it belongs to an outgrown system. It impedes the growth of communism. *Out of this conflict evil is born.* Do away then with private ownership and you do away with the conflict, the evil."

Such is the standpoint of the Social Democracy. It would be futile to attempt to refute the utter miscomprehension of the independence of man's spiritual life which is betrayed in such sentences. The Social Democrats have never, in fact, taken such a latitudinarianism seriously. Remember, for example, the way in which Marx lashes capital in his great work, or read all the fierce attacks of Social Democratic pamphlets against the "slave-spirit" of Christianity, against the immorality of Christian society, against the insatiable greed of the "profit-makers," and then decide whether or not the Social Democrats "recognize sin." None are so radically opposed to evil, or fight it so resolutely as Socialists. The very greatest value of their literature is the energy with which they combat the lower impulses of the human heart—greed, laziness, cruelty—an energy which can

be compared only with the denunciations of the Old Testament prophets. What the Social Democrats say about the origin of evil, its relative importance, etc., in a "scientific" way is only *theory*—untenable, foolish, superficial, if you please; but theory born out of the desperate endeavor to get great impulses expressed in language; the attempt to explain philosophically a condition which takes hold of them so seriously that they are at a loss to grasp it in terms of theology. And in fact the "shallowness" of the Social Democratic doctrine of sin is a great advance over the position held by the Church. *In the treatment accorded to sin by the Social Democrats we see the conviction that sin is a factor with which progress need not reckon at all.*

But exactly this is the message of the Gospel—that sin hath power no more!

2.

The Gospel and the Social Democracy touch each other at no point so clearly as in the doctrine of sin. The Gospel says: "One thing alone is of worth and weight—the Kingdom of God." The Social Democracy says: "One thing alone is real and true—Man and the Kingdom of Man."

The Social Democracy refuses (*why*, is unimportant) to let sin count. So does the Gospel. Thrones, principalities, princedoms, powers, as St. Paul says, laws, ideas, standpoints, errors, evils, sins, all the powers that bind and fetter men, fall to the ground before the Gospel. So do they before the Social Democracy.

The sole Power here is the living God—there the

living man. Are these two irreconcilable opposites, or are they not rather the two poles on which the life of man turns? Does not man belong to God, according to the Gospel? And is it not true then that nothing, *nothing* can stand between man and God—not even sin? (Romans 8.)

Since the coming of the Gospel a tremendous energy has taken hold upon the torpor and deadness of men—an energy for long centuries hidden under masses of rubbish, then breaking forth in mighty springs to bring new life to peoples: *the energy against sin!*

This energy was lacking in the antique civilization—therefore the antique civilization fell. The sages and philosophers of Greece and Rome discussed evil and wished it removed, but they had no unquenchable conviction to bring into the field against it. They were paralyzed by the illusion that evil is a necessary feature of human life, ordained by fate. This acquiescence in evil was the tomb of their civilization.

Then came the Gospel with its fire of conviction. But afterwards a secularized Christianity yielded to the pagan error of the inevitableness of sin. Again the Church preached of hell, and Christian philosophy discussed the omnipotence of evil. Now comes the Social Democracy and witnesses against this necessity of evil, and again there flames up in a million hearts in a thousand places the energy against sin!

3.

What is the teaching of the Gospel? "I will not

deal with them after their sins nor reward them according to their iniquities." (Psalms, 103.) This policy of God already hinted at in the Old Testament is carried into effect in the New. In dealing with the relations between God and men the Old Testament takes account of sin; the New does not. That is, in a word, the difference between the two. St. Paul, for example, says: "God has set before us Jesus as a propitiation through faith in his blood, in order that he may show forth his righteousness in that he forgives sin which till now was under divine patience." (Romans, 3, 25.) "As now through one man's sin came condemnation into the world, so by one man's righteousness justification has come to all men." (Romans, 5, 18.) (See also Romans, 5, 21; 6, 2; 4, 11.) The entire Epistle to the Hebrews is devoted to the consideration that under the old covenant sin regulated the relations of man to God. But now "with one sacrifice it is done away forever." (Hebrews, 10, 14.) (See also Ch. 9, 14-26; 10, 16-22; Colossians, 2, 13-15.)

The New Testament does not deny the fact of sin, nor the power of sin, but it denies its value as a factor in human life. Sin has been conquered, conquered once for all by Jesus on the Cross. God reckons with sin no more. To believe in God is to cease to believe in sin, to bear in one's heart the energy of the living God. What is salvation? What is grace? What is Christian life? *Only the energy of the living God.* All that the early Christians asked of religious or theological knowledge was the manifestation of this creative energy. All knowledge, dogma, philosophy which exists for itself is false. In true Chris-

tianity there is no doctrine that is not also deed. There ideal and real, word and act, knowledge and conduct are one—the spirit of the Lord rules all!

This is why the Gospel is the victory over the world and its sin. He who believes in the Gospel banishes evil. He who bows before evil brings the Gospel to shame. He who says, We cannot help evil, it is here; we cannot make the world other than it is, he is not a Christian but a pagan.

4.

But this is not the standpoint of the official Christian Church. The Church has lost its energy against sin, and has let sin again interpose between it and God. Therefore the Church has fallen into the power of lies. All its works and ceremonies, its piety and dogma are founded hereon. *The Christian religion lives by sin.* The Church separates God and man, for it is founded upon sin. The Church reckons with hell, its activity is all inspired by the sense of fear of evil. It is impractical, contemplative, turned toward the future. It leaves mundane things to take their course. *It is reconciled to the tyranny of sin.* So it has become a curse for men, not a blessing. It has deserted the living God—*it recognizes evil.*

Is it not true that the Church is founded on sin? On account of sin the pope sits on his lofty throne; on account of sin the village priest reads the mass. For the sake of sin the cloisters are built, wherein men imprison themselves because they cannot bear the fear of hell. In the fear of sin the Church has developed the sacraments, and brought princes and peoples to its confessional. A pious soul kneels be-

fore the saint's image. The prayer is a cry of fear; its object, forgiveness; its desire, release. A lonely man struggles in his cloister cell; he cannot find peace, he cannot trust in his God and what stands between him and God is *sin*. Elsewhere great armies go on pilgrimages to a sacred spot. They are driven by the hope of a milder fate on the judgment day. And if you raise your eyes to heaven, where one would think peace reigns, what will you see? Innumerable ranks of holy intercessors who surround God's throne to show forth their merits, that they may plead them on behalf of their erring brothers who are still in the sorrowful vale of earth.

But such superficiality brings its own punishment. Where the air is pest-laden with sin, where every divine thought is poisoned with sin, there spring up pride and presumption. Man does not endure this contradiction in himself. He therefore begins to play with sin. He does not take sin seriously, precisely because it is depicted to him as the only serious thing. When he sees easy forgiveness in store for him, and a whole race of priests whose business it is to mediate absolution, then he laughs at sin's terrors. He compounds with God. To-day wickedness —to-morrow confession. This everlasting talk of sin has spoiled him. He may sin, for he trusts the Holy Church whose business it is to forgive sin. Is it not the boast of the Church that it reaches every son with its forgiveness?

5.

Whole nations have perished on account of this frightful futility of soul. The Church is the stag-

gering example that taking sin seriously leads to taking it lightly. All the institutions and sacraments of forgiveness are only screens behind which the lust of sin shields itself. There is only one seriousness which does not change into its opposite in men's lives—*the seriousness for God.* Only he who is sure of God can conquer sin; he who is sure of sin becomes its slave.

No wonder that the Church, that grandiose institution for pardon, has no energy against sin. Had it been a Church of God instead of the church of sin, it would have long ago got rid of sin in the world. Like a living fire there would have sprung from its spirit the great powers of justice and righteousness, which work irresistibly in men, which talk not of "impossibilities," dream not of "inevitabilities," which act as they *must* act; which drive all timid considerations before them as the storm-wind drives the dry leaves; which know no law save—*This must be!*

Where God rules there rules the energy against sin. Where is an injustice that dares flourish in His presence? Where are the falsities that dare claim alliance with Him? Where are the lies and deceits that dare comfort themselves in His name? Must not wealth cease to sun itself in the miseries of the poor when God's energy fills all hearts? Must not the oppression, cruelty and robbery of the rich cease when God's power is revealed? Nothing, nothing withstands God's power. But the Church has rejected Him. It believes no longer in God; it believes in Satan. It deals with hell and haggles with sin. It is a den of

thieves and a house of merchandise. It "recognizes" sin. Therefore it has become a curse to the nations.

Has the Church not permitted every evil and injustice? *Is not its name everywhere invoked when wickedness celebrates its triumphs?* Who has offered the sword bloodier tasks, who has set up more scaffolds than the Church? What power invented the refined instruments of torture in the Middle Ages? Was it not the Church, whose lips always overflowed with the acknowledgment of sin, and whose offices offered an asylum from the punishment of sin? What more fearful irony!

In the conscience of a Saxon monk this inconsistency revealed itself. The strong hand of Luther tore in shreds this bogy of sin, when the truth of the scripture burst upon him: "*The just shall live by faith.*" He was privileged to see what no man before him saw, that all the works of the Church, its ceremonies, sacraments, dogmas, efforts and pains, its whole "piety" was a torment—a service of sin and not a service of God. The Gospel's simple truth shone in upon his soul that there is but one power, one rule, one reality—the living God in Jesus Christ. And as soon as Luther and the cloud of witnesses with him to this truth began to preach, there fell on the people the cooling showers of peace in the certitude of the living God. Christendom again understood what it meant to trust the living God, to serve and worship Him alone. It felt again the creative strength that abides in this certitude. It experienced the truth that he who has God has with Him all things. Everywhere the desire was born to shake off the old chains of dogma and the

rule of sin. *Men lived in the conviction that a new world must come.* Had not the Lord through His mighty spirit said: "Behold I make all things new." So to the work! Righteousness, truth, love, peace, all the powers of God—bring them to fruition, live them everywhere! Everywhere—*except in the social life.* When the impulse began to spread here, and economic conditions began to clamor for the light of the Gospel, then the Reformers (after a moment's wavering) ruthlessly struck that movement down.*

The Church had played with sin too long, had looked to heaven too long, while overlooking the injustice which was before its very eyes. Even while the Reformers were witnessing against this Church they transported into the new foundation the gravest fault of the old—the weakness against sin.

6.

From that day on the evangelical Churches too have held to the doctrine that sin cannot be overcome in this world. The evangelical dogmas, too, are oriented from the standpoint of sin, and incomprehensible without the assumption of sin. No hint that the Kingdom of God has conquered the kingdom of evil, and that Jesus Christ is victor over sin and death. Hell, whose doors Christ closed, rose in new might when the evangelical Church began to preach its doctrine—a faith in hell, more than a faith in God. All the blindness, all the quarrels, the cruelty, the folly which

*For a vivid and sympathetic account of the Peasants' Revolt of the sixteenth century, here referred to, see Chapter VII. of "*The Lamb Slain from the Foundation of the World*," by Richard Heath.

make so many dark pages in the Church's history have but one source—the recognition of the power of sin. At one and the same time, there have been, on the one hand, an inner, soul-felt Christian faith, and, on the other hand, poverty, misery, degeneration, endured by these same Christians and accepted by them as an inevitable fate. And they have not seen the frightful falsehood of this contradiction, they let the horror live. That was the impotence of the Church against sin.

There is only one task for Christians—*protest against sin.* Of what use to protest against the Catholic Church when this protestation itself bows before the very evil that has ruined Catholicism? Why so half-hearted! Why, O Protestant Church, art thou filled with horror at the Pope declaring himself infallible, and yet hast no horror for the infallibility of Mammon which obsesses all minds? Why such indignant words against the superstitions of the "Catholics," and none against the superstitions of greed and avarice? What touches your creed rouses elemental fury within you, but what smirches the honor of the Gospel you admit as "inevitable," ordained of God. You will not suffer your system to be gainsaid, but only God. You speculate on the origin of evil, on the magnitude of various sins, on man's responsibility, on the fall and redemption. All this you find instructive, useful, edifying—yes, even as edifying as that which has conquered all evil—the cross of Christ! You have great energy of spirit for orthodoxy and for freedom of thought, but energy for God is unknown to you! It appears to you only mysticism and exaggeration; you

detect beneath it the heresy of not taking sin "seriously" enough.

You have apparently no conception of the truth that the evangelical faith was born of the confidence that the power of sin was broken and *must cease*. The evangelical creed! it is only an orthodox sheet of paper for you. You say: "My Lord and my God!" but where *is* your God! Have you any right to accuse the Roman Church of the worship of idols?

The theses, the systems, the points of view, the dogmas which crowd each other within the hundred sects of Protestantism, are they not so many spiritual idols hiding the living God?

If the living God were your God these idols would fall; you would rub the sleep from your eyes and put on the helmet of salvation, the breastplate of righteousness, the shield of faith and the sword of the spirit. Out of your mouth would proceed the energy of God, the energy that conquers and annihilates sin. If you believed that only One rules, then you would no longer plead: I am powerless, sin is too strong for me. No! you would abolish greed and lust—those lies that now choke your religion; you would abolish the enmities and quarrels of your different sects, hatred, anger, uncleanness, pride, cowardice and unmanliness. Then you would comprehend *the energy against sin.*

7.

Our whole civilization is pagan, not Christian. All that is lacking is the return explicitly to the old gods, the worship at their shrines. Who knows how long it will be before Jupiter and Venus have their temples? The inclination is not wanting in our immoral society.

But we see nothing surprising in this. When the Church hesitates between God and Mammon, when it reckons with evil as with a decree of fate, when it thus opens its own doors to paganism, such a result as our modern civilization shows us—*outward splendor and inward despair*—is not especially remarkable. It is not strange, for example, that our mill owners and factory kings regard workers as simply the material for Mammon to use. Did not a Protestant minister himself—Malthus—indisputably prove by statistics that there are far too many births and, that hence the struggle for existence, with its sufferings and its horrors, is a divine necessity? Can we wonder at human brutality when for the most shameful infamies such indulgent names are found as "struggle for existence," "selection," "right of the strong"? Infamies? Who calls them such? Why only men who through bigotry or stupidity fail to appreciate the triumphs of the new civilization. Does not every child know that there are no infamies or outrages—that all is logical and necessary—that law and order rule?

Such is the conviction of the majority of men in our modern cultured society. And why should it not be? If God has indeed ordered things as they are, then His honor requires that we should be as familiar as possible with evil, that we should not let ourselves be moved by the sight of its victims as they stretch out miserable hands to us. *We* know the necessity of their sufferings: only they, in their ignorance, do not know it.

Who speaks of hardheartedness, cruelty, unfeelingness? Is not the sole cruelty that of teaching men to

believe in mercy, when we know that mercy is only a sentimental lie? The man who recognizes sin as a natural thing subjects himself to the censure of cruelty when he protests against the works of sin. For it is cruel to awaken hopes which science knows are only vain creations of the brain.

Only the man who does not believe in evil, and will not bend before its necessity, has the right to speak of the social question. But in the morass of our present life who are they that dare not to believe in evil? The conservatives? No! They see God's hand in the woes and ruins which sin brings. The liberals? No! They speak of social evolution, of the necessity of classes and grades, of the rights of property, and the like. The Church? No! It lisps its pious precepts, it mulls over the inscrutable decrees of God and prates of a better land beyond the grave. It bows before the evil that sin has created. It is impotent. Where are the hearts that still hope, the souls that still believe? Who are the men and women who are not dismayed, who look for better days, who are bringing in the victory of good?

They are the Social Democrats!

Is it not hope and salvation for our despairing world that there is still a party that denies the might of sin, and refuses to believe in the triumph of evil? When the Social Democrats began to preach, the old established society greeted their utopias with scorn. Their journals were forbidden, their speakers were persecuted. State and Church banded together to stifle the noxious doctrine in its infancy. Yet to-day the Social Democrats are the most powerful, consolidated

and purposeful party among us. Why? *They refuse to believe in evil!*

8.

Whoever does not believe in evil, the future is his!

Antiquity said: We are the creatures of fate; all is vanity; there is no purpose in things; our life is as nothing. Then came Jesus Christ and broke the bonds of fatalism. An old, spent Church said: There is nothing new in men. Then came the Reformers and woke new and undreamed of powers. Decadent modern philosophy drones its monotone: There is nothing but cause and effect, mechanism, fatality. And in the midst of the sigh of philosophy is already heard the mighty trumpet-tone of the Social Democracy.

The Social Democracy is tirelessly active, irresistible. It makes a way through old underbrush of custom and convention. It splits the rocks asunder and moves mountains. It fills the valleys and dries the streams. It makes the crooked straight, the rough smooth, the sick well. Do you wonder why? It is because it does not believe in the power of evil. God's spirit breathes upon it.

To live means to believe not in evil; to say to sin, Cease! It means to strive for a world clear as the sun. That is the life which Jesus reveals. The Social Democracy to-day drinks from the spring of his inspiration. Therefore it lives, while all other parties are dead.

What is it that the Social Democrats demand? They demand that private ownership shall be changed into common ownership. Never has so mighty a demand been made on society, never a more wonderful

program conceived. Judge as we may of its practicability—it takes a mighty faith earnestly to cherish such a program. To abolish the unjust state and our traditional form of society; it is almost incomprehensible how rational beings could set up such an aim—the boldest, the most comprehensive the world has ever known. To substitute for the various jealous nations of to-day a world-brotherhood. A mere dream surely. Nay, they really believe such a brotherhood is coming —*believe it with Isaiah, with Jesus, with the Apostles.* Our society, bound as it is to Mammon, cannot understand these ideals. It judges the words of the Social Democrats as foolish, enthusiastic dreams; because the Social Democrats have thrown away the standpoints of little faith, of despair and of world-wisdom which control all our thinking. Nothing is easier than to call such an attitude folly—and nothing more pitiable!

9.

If it is true, as one of the opponents of the Social Democracy says, that "so long as the world stands men will remain as they are, full of selfish interests and desires" (Otto Hamann, *The Communistic Society*, pp. 64-65), why then have the very spirits that have refused to believe this commonplace always had the greatest influence on their contemporaries and on posterity? Measured by this wisdom, Jesus was a foolish dreamer, the Apostles were senseless idealists, the Reformers crazy innovators. But we live to-day by their "follies" and most by the greatest of them all—the faith in the victory of God over the evil. Eradicate that faith from the hearts of men and they sink

to the level of brutes. If we were the half-men that the opponents of the Socialists say we are, without any absolute ideal or demand in our nature, without the eternal truths that fill our bosom, then life would be poor indeed. Are the truths of man's life all to be found on the surface? Is the first commonplace that comes to hand eternal truth? Is only that true which we handle with our hands and see with our eyes? Nay, rather, that is true which we bear upon a forceful will, that which bursts our petty life asunder and opens eternal perspectives for us!

And why always separate this world from another? Why forever say, "So long as this world stands" this or that will not be? Does not this really mean "I do not believe in any other world"? Eternity has no *when* and *where*. Man must will, must dare, must believe, then man seizes upon eternity. "Folly"—to be sure! but what right has our cold philistinism to set up the standards of judgment? Because our self-indulgent society does not believe that things will ever be different on this earth, because it has made so close a league with evil that it is no longer able to see beyond its own dark horizon, shall it therefore arrogate to itself the right to judge new and fresh impulses? Men will not be better, it says. What men? Those who are mirrored in their own littleness, or those who are moving beyond their ken to a glorious future? If *you* have faith no more, shall all men be faithless? If you have ceased to believe, must all men cease? If your flames of hope have sunk to ashes, shall no more fires spring up in the hearts of men? But why reason

with you—you have no eyes for these things. No one should demand of you more than you are capable of.

10.

But why do men who still have a grasp on high and noble things give forth such incomprehensible words as these: "Dreamers have never understood anything about men's sins. They have always looked on sin as a certain stain which the waters of good fortune could wash out. So do the Social Democrats understand it. They judge the men of this capitalistic age, especially the rich, with a harder judgment than any zealous preacher of fasts and penance, and, *mirabile dictu,* they pass from this ethical pessimism to a touching ethical optimism as soon as they begin to speak of the future. We know what sin is—the fundamental corruption of the heart estranged from God. And this is why we answer the whole ethical system, present and future, of the Social Democracy with the single word: Dreams." (Fr. Naumann, *What do We do Against the Faithless Social Democracy?*)

In spirit I see a man in a long mantle, preaching to the inhabitants of a great city; "And it shall come to pass in the last days that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills, and all nations shall flow into it. And many people shall go and shall say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and He will teach us of His ways and we will walk in His paths; for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. And He shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many peo-

ple; and they shall beat their swords into plow-shares and their spears into pruning-hooks. Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." (Isaiah 2, 2-4.)

How did these words sound in the ears of the God-forgetting people of Jerusalem! All who heard them were convinced that the greatest of dreamers was before them. Even in those days they "knew what sin was" and for the ethical system of Isaiah, present and future, they had the one word: Dreams!

Does not the Gospel of Jesus teach us to preach this very "foolishness"? What kind of salvation is it that does not loose the fetters of sin, what kind of redemption that is still covered with the black shadow of evil? Why did Jesus on the cross cry, "It is finished"—if the powers of hell and darkness still rule!

We preach the Gospel of Jesus when we announce that all powers, principalities and thrones, sin and hell have sunk to the dust. Only One rules—the living God! We preach the Gospel when in the midst of the domain of sin we set up the Kingdom of the living God! Why this continual talk of sin? Why speak now of corruption, now of redemption, now of heaven, now of hell? Why not speak of God alone?

"But," you say, "for all that, sin is here, and the Social Democrats flatly deny its presence." O, why this anxiety as to what the Social Democrats say, when you are convinced that this "godless party" is a negligible quantity? To be sure, their negation of sin is a solecism, a theory in the air; but why will you not see what is behind this theory—that it is that very Gospel, that "good news" that has long been kept

under by the Christian Church? The impulse which drives the Social Democrats to this denial is the impulse of the Gospel. And when rightly understood, when seen in its grand significance, there is no more hopeful sign in the world than this with which Christians reproach the Social Democrats: "They do not recognize sin."

CHAPTER VI.

"THE SOCIAL DEMOCRACY BELIEVES ONLY IN MATTER AND REJECTS SPIRIT."

But now comes the strongest objection of all against the Social Democrats; it is that they believe in no future life, that they ignore spiritual things and recognize only the material. Their religion is materialism, which leads to a dissolute pursuit of pleasure and to the unchaining of the animal instincts. Let us now examine this charge.

I.

"Matter is a secondary thing. It is only the scene where God has put men for this life. It will pass away. So long as we are in this material world we are subject to sin, stained with sin. Matter hinders our spirit from its full development. And so our earthly task is to strip from ourselves all material bonds so far as possible. To give matter much consideration, to make it the standard for the estimate of men's happiness and worth, as the Social Democrats do, is a fatal error. It is placing spirit under the yoke of matter. But matter is here only that spirit may win its own by antagonism thereto. Matter itself signifies nothing!"

Matter signifies nothing! So speaks Christianity since the Platonic philosophy replaced the spirit of the Gospel. And Christianity knows not what it says. Never has a greater piece of irony been spoken, never

a greater lie believed than this "Christian" doctrine of the insignificance of matter.

"We despise matter, we deliver spirit from its bonds, we celebrate our chief triumph in fleeing the temptations of the body." So spoke the great leaders of the Church. They built mighty cathedrals to the spirit, they erected numberless cloisters and established quiet retreats for prayer—but before long the walls of these temples of the spirit became the scene of the noisy orgies of materialism. Even the heroes of the spirit who resisted the invasion of matter, who by means of cruel, pitiless self-chastisements sought to eliminate the last traces of the earthly from their lives, died broken, wasted, defeated, with the confession on their lips that this frightful conflict was a delusion. Man cannot down matter. Not alone because he is too weak, but above all because God Himself, the creator of matter, forbids it.

2.

The Church desires to establish the reign of the spirit in the realm of matter; but meanwhile it heaps property on property with greedy hands, and sees the only way to its spiritual riches in—money. Jesus said, "Ye cannot serve God and Mammon." But his Church thinks it can do it: God with the lips, Mammon with the heart. But the punishment is fearful: the service of God becomes a pretence for the service of Mammon. He who separates spirit and matter defames the Creator. The Church has gone to pieces, has lost all respect and influence, on account of this error. Men speak of the Church's insatiable maw. That

which the Church considers its spirituality, men think of as only superstition. It is no longer served except from calculation, no longer obeyed except from fear. It is up to its eyes in matter because it pretends to be spirit.

In this decadence Protestant is like Catholic. "We must not seek for perishing goods"—so cry the Protestant ministers, and all the while they are intent on bettering their position, on attaining all the honors they can, establishing themselves comfortably in the world. Office, position, influence, the friendship of the rich—these are the moving impulses. "We renounce every vanity," chant Christian capitalists at their devotions in the house of God; and on the morrow they use every device of the modern wage system to squeeze the tribute to Mammon out of their employes. The sects, parties, brotherhoods all talk of heaven, and have no more eager care than earthly prosperity. And this is the Christianity that boasts to have conquered matter!

3.

The hypocrisy of Christianity consists not so much in its failure to practice its doctrine of the conquest of matter, as in its thinking it possible to lay down any such doctrine. Its theory is false, displeasing to God; therefore the conduct of Christendom must be hypocrisy. You cannot be good Christians because your Christianity is false. You believe that matter is insignificant—but God created man of spirit *and* matter. You believe you must put off matter—but God has put it on you and on all men. You look constantly to heaven —but God gave men this earth for a dwelling place.

You fight against God's laws, and oppose your "Christianity" to his life-commandments. Matter is not diabolic; the love of matter—comfort yourselves!—is not evil; the enjoyment of matter is not sinful. Even its orgies are reactions against the false usurpation of a God-forsaking "spirit." Matter is the seat of sin only when men despise it.

4.

When man broke away from God he created for himself the kingdom of the spirit—of his own thoughts, plans, ends. He wanted to be mighty, to rule in a certain realm—and he called that realm "spirit." This spirit finally succeeded in completely discrediting matter (in the Greek philosophy). The body became merely a fetter on the spirit, a dark prison-house whose doors were opened by death alone. Life became a deception, the world of sense a lie. Only the ideal, only the conceptual was true—not the created, the actual. Men dreamed and wrote of a world that never and nowhere existed, and the real world with all its forms and colors was contemned. Men sacrificed their actual happiness, their present delights, to a future happiness of which they knew nothing. No greater pride, no deeper joy, than to martyrize the body in a thousand ways, for the sake of the spirit.

Jesus appeared and re-established the rights of creation. He taught us that this world should be God's garden. He gave us back our joy in life.

Then men began again to see with seeing eyes, to hear with hearing ears and to understand with open senses. Wherever the Christians set up

their dwelling places, the spirit returned to matter, to shape it for the praise of the Creator and to command it in God's name. Sin and vice, the creations of the self-glorifying pride of spirit, vanished. Human intercourse again took on honest forms. Marriage recovered its original purity. Toil came again into honor. Rich and poor acknowledged each other brothers in a higher unity of spirit. The living God took the place of the phantasmagoria which the cult of the "spirit" had produced. No longer was there separation between body and soul. All was united in the one great reality of the common Creator—the living God.

5.

But again men broke away from their God and attempted to be wise in their own "spiritual" power. And again it became apparent that Godlessness is a sin against creation. Godlessness appears in the contempt of matter. Spirit not matter is the enemy of God; for matter cannot do evil while spirit can. It is the evil of the spirit that has ruined God's fair creation.

Instead of bringing the whole world, with all its sufferings and pains, in the name of Jesus Christ to the living God; instead of making the Kingdom of God a reality on earth, the Christians began again to turn their longing gaze toward heaven as if the Savior of the world had never come down from heaven to earth to manifest the power of God. And as a punishment for this loss of faith, all the powers, principalities, thrones of false spirits asserted anew their

old tyranny. Speculative theology, Christian philosophy and dogmas appeared, and with them—blindness. Orthodoxy appeared, and with it—stagnation. "Spirit" appeared—and with it the contempt for matter.

These profound errors spring directly from the misunderstanding of the task which God has set for Christianity in this world. The Church has turned its mind to things that have nothing to do with the Kingdom of God. In its speculations we may see the sign of its neglect of duty. It contemplates its own grandeur, speaks of its truth, displays itself in its piety, and its ceremonies; it sets itself up as the great power to which all peoples must submit; it curses and blesses; it invents fine-spun logic and profound dogmas; it ascends to heaven to behold the mystery of the Trinity, and then fathoms the depths of hell. It knows all, understands all, embraces all. It is the great institution of salvation, glimmering in its own splendor. Nobody understands why it must be so, or what good this splendor serves, for in this world men continue to suffer and to sigh.

All this is what "spirit" has done, and all had to be, because "spirit" would construct a kingdom of its own, which treads matter under foot and stamps the creation of the living God into dust. The Church forsooth must philosophize, lay down principles, anathematize, must fight the heretic—but it cannot *help*. For helping the world means breathing new life into matter. And the church's key-note is the despite of matter. If the Church had had less "spirit" and more understanding of matter and of the thousand du-

ties arising therefrom, it would have been a blessing to the world.

6.

Such has been the course of the ancient historic Church, and to-day the Protestant Church as well is fighting the Social Democracy on the ground of this same one-sided, arrogant, "spirit"-worship. It fights with the shield of Protestant faith and the Protestant sword of the spirit. It writes, disputes, sets argument against argument, refutes, prophesies, but it does not realize that its own spirit bears witness against it, and that its subtle dogmas but mirror its great sin of omission in the very sphere where God has set it to work—the material world. When its theologians and preachers come before the people with their ready conceptions of the gospel, from whence do they derive the right to these interpretations? When Stoecker and Naumann, from the Conservative or the Social Reform platform protest against the Social Democracy, how is it that they do not see that "theories" are borne away like straws before the mighty sweep of a movement which with all its passionate soul demands *realities?* How did Stoecker know that the amalgam of Gospel and Fatherland, of the word of God and loyalty to the king, which he preached with such zeal, was the authentic word of God; and with what right did Naumann bring the social question into the focus of his Christianity? Was not such a Christianity simply these gentlemen's own imagination? Did not the whole Christian Social Reform movement, with its half questions and half answers, show clearly enough that its champions, tyrannized over by the con-

ception of "spirit," had not done any real thinking on the fundamental social questions, the questions of matter? If the Church wishes to have any influence in the social movement, it must recognize that the establishment of *righteous economic conditions* is one of the most pressing duties we owe to the Creator—a duty no less than allegiance itself.

The whole history of the Church proves that "spirituality" alone is not able to control the realities of this earthly life, to bring them under a law of righteousness.

And from this point of view the "hypocrisy" of the Christian life is seen in an entirely different light. It even wakes a certain sympathy in us—the sympathy one accords to the victim of a tragic fate. Much sincere mental toil is hidden in the "hypocrisy" of the Christian Church. An army of noble souls have spent themselves in its service. They thought themselves called upon to force matter under the scepter of spirit, to crush the very postulates of God—and did not see that by so doing they were breaking God's first commandment. Hence the "hypocrisy." It appears in the painful antagonism between Christianity with its asceticism and matter with its inevadibility. He who tries to despise matter—he is the very one who is most susceptible to its charms.

7.

The living God and matter: These are the two realities which in man are united in that marvelous harmony that distinguishes him from all other living beings. His spirit is comprehended in the living God,

and is great only so long as it dwells in God. As soon as it isolates itself from God and endeavors to establish a false independence, it falls into the errors of fantasy and the slavery of mere creations of the brain. In God's life he lives and works and performs his duty—his duty to matter. "Subdue the earth and fill it". Such is the first command of God to men, and with its accomplishment their life is filled. When men set up other and unrelated tasks for themselves, they fall into error, madness and death. This is the reason why men have never been so joyous in hope and in creative work as to-day, in this epoch of technical inventions, in spite of the shadows which persist. "Materialism" (let weak souls shudder!) is the cause, for that is the way out of the bogs of "spirituality" to firm ground, to our original task, our health, our happiness, our salvation.

When material progress ceases then the welfare of men is at a standstill. It was not the Greeks who opened the world to civilization; it was the Romans—the people who broke the path for material improvement. Not Catholicism, but Protestantism brought in the new era, because it knew how to win hearts for the joy of the hearth, the sanctity of work, of trade, as well as for pious dogmas. And to-day it is not the Church with all its products of the "spirit," not the State, not any of the old institutions that are furthering the progress of man, but the Social Democracy alone, because it alone understands that material conditions are the true field of human activity. It again understands the full import of that original command of God: "Subdue the earth and fill it." Its thinking

and its doing are real. Therefore, it is strong. The reality of the living God stands behind it.

8.

There is a great truth in the contention of the Social Democracy that the material conditions of every age mirror themselves in the thoughts and ideas of men, and that these ideas are consequently nothing else than the measure of the elevation or depression of material conditions. The Social Democracy has no doubt brought this truth into discredit by too great an insistence on its absoluteness. It is folly, of course, to maintain that all law, morality, philosophy, religion are simply products of economic conditions. One of the great faults of the Social Democracy is that it forgets that man himself is among the "realities" of the world; that he is not the mere sum of nourishment, air, housing and clothing to which the materialism of a Buechner or a Moleschott would reduce him; that behind his ideas there is an independent force which can be influenced by these things, but is not created by them.

The truth that in every epoch economic conditions are reflected means simply that man is in closest connection with matter and cannot separate himself therefrom. The Social Democracy is entirely right in its perception that human history till now has presented an irrational spectacle, and the further conclusion is also justified that this irrationality comes from the false position spirit has taken over against matter. The "progress" of the human spirit is nothing else than the repeated attempt of men to master matter, the elements of the immediate life that God

has given them. Therefore all thought of philosophy, all morality and religion, are in closest connection with man's economic state. As soon as that connection is recognized and hallowed the false independence of "spirit" with its artificial ideas, theories, systems, will cease. This conviction makes the strength of the Social Democracy.

9.

The Social Democracy sees in the creeds of the Church useless theories which have served only to throw a glamor of divine justification over an unrighteous state of society. The faith of the Christians, so they say, makes them indifferent to their immediate duties, blinds them to the real meaning of things and teaches them to recognize the will of God in all the horrors of history. They set faith alongside of life, and dream of a future bliss not connected with this world, but for the attainment of which all pains and sorrows must be endured here. "Christianity is the enemy of liberty and civilization. Through its doctrine of passive obedience to the powers 'ordained of God' and its preaching of patience and submission joined to the promise of future bliss, it has tempted men away from their real purpose in life which is to develop themselves in every manner possible and to enjoy the good things of life which they win by their toil." (*Christianity and Socialism,* Leipzig, 1878, p. 10.)

This accusation is on the whole just. Christianity has not been able to bridge the chasm between the various classes of men. It has let the frightful ravages of Mammon go unrebuked, yes, even commended and

legitimatized the evil. It has preached flight from the world, not conquest of the world. It is unfruitful. All real progress has had to be made over the head of so-called Christianity. A terrible accusation, but, alas, it is true. True, because our "Christianity" speaks falsely.

Christianity speaks falsely when it maintains that a separation between earth and heaven has been ordained by God. It fails in truth when it says that this earth is but a vale of tears and that all happiness lies beyond. It is false when it says that material concerns are all of secondary interest. It is false when in its own proud spirit it builds up an imaginary kingdom of heaven outside of all reality. The spirit of God rules *in* and *through* matter; it "brooded over the waters" at the creation.

When we wish to prove the reality of charity we point triumphantly to the stone facades of our benevolent institutions. And we are right, for goodness that consisted in "spirit" alone would not be real. Virtue is not in the thought, but in the act. "Inasmuch as ye *did* it." And the deed must concern itself with matter. It is as St. James said: "Beloved brethren, what doth it profit if a man have faith but not works? Can faith save him? If a brother or sister among you were naked and lacked his daily bread, and one of you said, 'Go in peace, be warmed and fed,' but gave not unto him what he needed, what would it profit? So faith without works is dead." (James 2, 14.)

There is no faith that does not exercise itself in deeds, no will that does not cause changes in the

material world, no morality that does not express itself in earthly relations. We are inevitably joined to matter, all our senses are filled with its tones and colors. We cannot think of life without it.

10.

But the prevailing Christianity says that matter makes us slaves and beasts, that only when we declare ourselves the uncompromising foes of matter can we taste peace and joy. To live with matter means—death. And the preachers ask triumphantly, "Does not the New Testament teach us this? Above all the words of Jesus himself? 'My kingdom is not of this world,' he said to his disciples: 'I go to prepare a place for you.' Was not his whole activity directed toward heaven, and does he not speak of the prince of this world who has naught to do with him? Did he not say, 'What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?' And would you hear what the Apostles say, we are embarrassed by the wealth of texts which we could cite. In almost every chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, the Epistles to the Corinthians, and all the rest, you will find the same idea repeated. 'Seek what is above, not what is on earth' (Colossians, 3, 2), 'Our conversation is in heaven' (Phil. 3, 2), 'Flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God' (I Cor. 15, 50), etc., etc. (Compare Eph. 1, 3; II Cor. 5, 1; 5, 6; I Cor. 15, 53; Rev. 21, 1-4)."

11.

We do not doubt the truth of any of these texts, but we fail to see in them any proof of the separation

between heaven and earth, which exists in Christian thought. Most assuredly Jesus revealed another world, but the heaven of which the New Testament speaks is something entirely different from the heaven of which authorized Christianity preaches. The former is full of living force; the latter is dead and motionless. The former inspires men in this world; the latter waits till they have died. The former stands for world-conquest; the latter for world-flight. The former includes "the whole creation," the latter excludes the world.

The heaven of the New Testament is the dwelling place of the living God. But where God dwells no dark places can be, no sin or evil, nothing that is opposed to him. There matter, his own creation, is illuminated with a divine light. To believe in Jesus means to claim the whole creation for God, above all to believe that the world is God's. His disciples are those whose faith has overcome the world. They do not shun matter; they conquer it, and shape it to the praise of the Creator. How foolish the talk of "above" and "below," "higher" and "lower," "present" and "future," "earth" and "heaven" for the man who stands in the reality of God and sees all other realities in that light. Such an one is not speculating upon a happier future—the best is already in his hands, he is working with it cheerfully, faithfully. His conversation is already in heaven, as Jesus' was—in the heaven of God's world.

This heaven is no excuse for laziness and inner contemplation, no legitimation of earthly pain. No. He who has this heaven overcomes the world and

creates new things; he stops not at hindrances, fears no difficulties. He does not cease laboring until all the crooked, tangled paths of the earthly life are made straight, until darkness is lightened, and tears dried. For the world is God's. It must be snatched from the cruel claws of Mammon. The energy for this is from Jesus Christ. In his power all earthly interests are drawn into the sphere of the eternal life.

Why then do Christians say that matter is evil? Because they know not God, and do not believe in His life-giving power. If they did they would be convinced that the earth must cease to be the theater of Mammon's rule; they would give up their fine-spun dogmatics as worthless cobwebs of thought. Dogmatics exist only where faith has ceased. They are a substitute for work. The whole history of Christianity is one long, comfortable plea in favor of—inactivity. Hence Christianity is most heartily rejected by the men who set most by work—the Social Democrats. "We demand that the frightful, accursed state of our present industrial society shall cease", they cry. "You may keep your faith, your dogmas, your systems to mull over as you will—only for heaven's sake *do something.*" Which side has the faith, Christians or Social Democrats?

12.

Christians may say matter is a secondary thing, but is it true? Why then do you make such a cry when you lack the material comforts of life? Why then does money rule the Christian Church? And

why do you see in outward success or failure the blessing or the curse of God?

Still we will not quarrel. We will admit that this is all weakness and illogical behavior, which you yourselves confess and bemoan. But we must ask: If material conditions are secondary, why then does it seem an impossible thing to you to remedy their abuses? If it is a little thing in your eyes that the poor are hungry while the rich luxuriate in idleness, why do you not get these little inconveniences out of the way?

"It makes no difference," you say, "how a man is situated; the only thing of importance is his relation to heaven." But does your rich Christian ever change fortunes with the poor man, to give the world an edifying spectacle of brotherly love? Or is it, as some bitter tongues say, only the poor for whom those comforting words about the insignificance of the material conditions of life are meant? Does the Church prove its sincerity by saying: "You rich are of no more worth than the poor for your money's sake. You distinguished men in high places, we honor you no more than the lowly, for your position's sake. All these things are secondary; we honor character alone." Does the Church do so—or does it with one hand doff the cap to Mammon and with the other shut the door in the face of the poor?

If the material, if possessions and money, were secondary things, insignificant things in our Christian society, not a week need pass before all social troubles were ended. For what could hinder us from establishing our heaven here? Not unfaith, im-

patience, weakness; no! we draw our power from God! Not political or social conditions; no! we belong to the Kingdom of God! not Mammon surely; no! we serve the living God, and our task is to overcome Mammon. No, nothing shall hinder us, for we "can do all things through him that strengtheneth us, through Christ." Is this true? Can we do this "all" through Christ? Is not that rather a pious phrase? Do not, on the contrary, the material questions lie like a nightmare on the conscience of Christendom? It is not true that the material is a secondary matter for Christendom; the material is a primary reality which determines all Christian faith and action. It is not true that Christians disdain earthly conditions. The phrase, "Money signifies nothing" is a subterfuge for the pious rich.

Christianity has fallen a shameful victim to Mammon. Christians have lost the power of God, and they seek to cover their service of Mammon with the lie that "matter is secondary." They cry "spirit, spirit!" *and live devoted to matter.* They contemn matter, and lie prisoners in its fetters.

13.

And this is sin. *Sin is the false relation of spirit and matter;* spirit embracing matter with the whole passion of its thirsting life, and at the same time pretending to push matter away, to be disgusted with its dead weight. Sin oscillates between the poles of desire and pride. So we may understand why the Church has never conquered sin. It has talked only

of "spirit;" it has thought with spirit to oppose matter, but it has thereby only given an advantage to evil.

Sin and Mammon grew with equal strides with the false emancipation of the spirit. The ages in which the proud, self-deifying spirit has brought to light the works of splendid culture, have always been ages also of moral decline, of unbridled license. It is not matter, but spirit that is to blame. For spirit is the lord of matter. But spirit becomes the slave of matter when it breaks the bond between the two.

The more harmonious a man or a society keeps the relation between matter and spirit, the happier is the life. The more service that mind wrests from matter, the more it is *spirit and power.*

The spirit of God rules matter. Only the spirit of Christendom builds itself a kingdom outside of matter. Therefore in the spirit of God alone are the powers of a new world, of changes, improvements, progress by which men live; while in the spirit of present Christianity is only stagnation, retrogression, reaction, darkness. *If our Christianity is again to have life it must address itself to matter.*

14.

Thou speakest with ecstasy of the salvation that is thine in Jesus, and searchest to mediate that joy to a fellow-man. But if matter were in thy power, if thy salvation could only stream into all the garrets and cellars in which fellow-men are stewing, that would be a proof, a salvation for which thou wouldst willingly give all thy theological dogmas, all thy pious prayer-books. What is eternal life if not the stream

of health that flows out from the throne of God, that pours its healing not only over the heart and mind, but also over the body and its members? What is this future kingdom if not a new earth in which righteousness dwells? What do the words that celebrate thy heaven say? "I will wipe away all tears from their eyes."

Even so, thou sayest, but all this is to be understood in a spiritual, not a material sense. Spiritual? Does not the Apostle Paul tell us of our celestial bodies that we shall put on? Does not the revelation of St. John speak of the heavenly Jerusalem that shall descend upon the earth? The heavenly body—is that *no* body? Is heaven identical with *nothing?* Is it God's purpose to destroy his creation or to cleanse it? Does not the whole Bible say to us: The end of God's dealings with man is bodily renewal?

But thou repliest: "The glorified body will indeed come; but now we are in the midst of dust and evil. When this world passes the better will come. Then death will be swallowed up by life, evil will vanish and one life, one light shall shine through all God's new creation."

Again thou puttest everything off to the future! How canst thou talk so calmly of the future and not have a desire to-day to give thyself to the power of this eternal life? Did Jesus always set to-morrow against to-day? Was this not rather the way of that unprofitable servant who said: "My lord tarries, therefore I will do what pleases me." Did not Jesus say: "Let your loins be girded and your lights be burning." Should we not make this future true and

bring it in by our daily faith and works? O, if God in some future is going to bring all creation into his saving power, why now hesitate and tremble? Why say to matter: "We know you not." Why say to "dust," which God will redeem in the future: "We despise you." Why say to the earth, which God will renew and fill with his life: "We renounce you." Why not this moment claim for God the whole creation? Why, O Christendom, so weak, so lame, so faithless? O, forsake doubt, destroy the cobwebs of theology and be clothed in the spirit of God—then matter, which thou now abhorrest but which is thy master, will be in thy power.

This truth the Social Democracy has understood. Its immense energy drinks from the sources of life. It honors and prizes this life that the Creator has called into being. Christendom calls it their "materialism." But what makes it *materialism,* if not the fault of thy ghostly Christianity? Thou hast given them no other word for it, O Christendom!

Yes, it is true, the Social Democrats deny spirit. They reject the brain-fancies, the philosophies, the theologies, the abstractions of the spirit—all. They see in them only the cowardly faithlessness of a generation that has refused its task, God's task. And they are right!

CHAPTER VII.

"THE SOCIAL DEMOCRACY DENIES THE ABSOLUTE VALUE OF LAW AND MORALITY."

I.

"One who attends the meetings of the Social Democrats forms a peculiar impression. The speakers storm against the injustice of present conditions, and demand equality and humanity in the name of natural right, but in unfolding their Socialist plans they leave all questions of morals on one side." (Masaryk: *The Philosophical and Sociological Foundations of Marxism.*) "The Socialists," such objectors say, "speak of law and order as relative terms, and assume variations of morality in the human race as historical and logical necessities. But once take away from morality its absolute transcendent value and make it a mere phenomenon conditioned on certain historical stages of evolution, and there is an end of man's moral dignity. Such is, however, the Socialist thought; and we know no greater danger to our modern life."

It is remarkable how much men have to say (in arguments) about their "moral dignity" and how little they are willing to direct their lives according to it. Our modern society, in spite of its religiosity, is honey-combed with immorality to its very core; it permits the unclean to flourish and then is indignant when one begins to doubt the validity of its morals.

Everything is allowed—if it is only hidden. Deceit is the key-note of business, and it brings no disgrace so long as it keeps out of court. The *anonymous* is the trump card in the game of our modern civilization. A man may *be* a swindler, but must not be *called* so; he may visit the brothel and wallow in sensuality, but he must never get the *name* of rake. So long as he avoids the name he is safe. So long as he keeps out of the columns of the yellow paper he is respectable. Our society makes a parade of morality because it has none; it grows furious over a little scandal, to hide its own great scandal. Its morality is the painted shield of its immorality. And it is this society which pretends to be shocked at the Social Democrats' conception of law and morality. We know the sources of this indignation and its motives.

2.

The criminal sits in his cell, within bare walls, his legs in irons. A friendly spider has spun its web around the iron grated window, lying in wait for the flies buzzing about the place.

How does it happen that men get into prison?

This man has seized some of the goods of his richer neighbor—but if it is true that his children were crying in vain for bread at home; if it is true that the accused man was driven to desperation by society; if those pictures of social cruelty and hard-heartedness which the counsel of the accused set before the judges are true, what should we say then? What is the meaning of the law, "Thou shalt not steal"? Does it not ring in the chaos of our modern

society like a bitter curse in our ears? Has Christian society a right to enforce that commandment, when it treads underfoot that other commandment: "There shall be no beggar among you"? (Exod. 15, 17.) *Is not our whole economic system a huge robbery, and are not the poor robbed daily of their holiest rights?* And shall we think we are doing God's work in writing the Ten Commandments on the prison walls of poor rascals?

But let us not be partial. Let us confess that there are thieves too who steal not out of need but out of preference, who defy righteousness and law, and bring on themselves their own merited punishment. But why?

3.

We are well acquainted with the large mass of lawful citizens, men who always pay their taxes, who keep all the laws, who give the police nothing to do, who never even jump from a tramcar in motion—good, honest citizens. But are they always better than the criminals?

There are honest citizens who boast of knowing nothing of jails except what they read in the papers when they put on their slippers and sink into a comfortable arm-chair after a day's work. They do not steal, but they find no offense in our economic world which is a vast scheme of swindling. They do not murder, but they laugh and joke over the poor man's lack of cleverness which forfeits his livelihood. They do no one any harm—or any good either. They live like snakes in their several dens. They die and an

inscription on their tombs lauds them to a posterity like themselves.

There is truth in the old proverb: "There are many in jail who ought to be in honor; and there are many in honor who ought to be in jail."

Is the impatience with laws that hinder all men's yearnings for freedom, that oppose like a wall of granite all his efforts at deliverance from the bondage of past error—is it all wickedness alone?

You answer perhaps: "Yes, but the obedience which endures the law, inwardly freeing self from its bonds, is greater than open revolt against it." But that is only a phrase in your mouth, because you do not know what freedom means.

4.

I will tell you something startling. In your own heart the enemy is sleeping, whose voice you so dread to hear; in the depths of your own being are springing up those flames of revolt which your shocked sense of citizenship is trying to keep under. You boast of a moral standpoint. Good! Nothing is better than morality. We agree with you fully. We praise the words of a witness to the glory of morality: "The moral idea draws after it a whole chain of creative works. It is not weakness. It is an instrument of elevation, of freedom. Its whole development stands before us as a battle for spiritual independence and inner self-reliance."

And still when you probe deeply into your own moral consciousness, do you not often find an elemental dissatisfaction with mere morality, a protest

against it. You talk in the finest words about just thoughts, sense of duty, the dignity of man—but do you feel that you truly have that dignity? Only occasionally in your life do you rise to a momentary appreciation and exemplification of it. What troubles you in others is just the fact that you must force yourself to preserve at least the appearance of a good conscience, or in the last event to yield a sour, vexed obedience to the inexorable demands of your conscience.

Yes, "demands!" When have you appropriated with a joyous heart the luminous world of morality, how often have you felt at home in that lofty domain? Ever, again and again, you have had to force yourself to conform to the requirements of that world, and you have been obliged to recognize that an insurmountable wall of separation arose between it and you.

And that fact disturbs you to the depth of your soul.

It is obviously not the command of the good, but the good itself that charms and attracts you. When you say the good "ought" to be and must be, you are but showing an inherited confusion of thought. Not only ought the good to be, but it is; it cannot otherwise than be. Somewhere there is a world where it fulfils itself without restraint, where it is not an ideal and a law. It is because you bear in yourself this essential world of good that you speak of a good which ought to be. It wells up within you and would overflow your whole being, but it dashes itself against the barriers of your present world and is broken and dissipated by the economic and social conditions. It

is split into a thousand petty demands and conventions—and these are what your world and you call morality.

Against this morality of shattered fragments your better self rises within you!

5.

Law and morality point beyond themselves to a better order. To try to reconcile them with the present order means to make them a covering for wickedness, and so a curse. Therefore the Social Democracy rises against the current conception of law and morality. It accuses them of being only a pretext with which the rich legalize their greedy interests. It says: Law and morality have never been anything but a defensive weapon for the men in power. Law is injustice and morality is slavery. And one episode after another in world-history proves the truth of this assertion. A frightful state of things—law and morality in the service of Mammon! But so it is.

This summer at the railroad station at N——— the train was ready to start; the last blast of the whistle had sounded, when lo—a running and a shouting, a thrusting of heads from all the windows! What was it? An elegant gentleman rushing up at the last moment, behind him a pack of sweating porters. The gentleman got in, and demanded his handbag from the nearest porter. There was a row over the pay, a violent, vulgar haggle over a couple of pennies. And meanwhile the train stood waiting, the officials rooted to their places in obsequious deference to the elegant gentleman. The disgusting scene came to an end,

the train started and the travelers said to one another: "If that had been a poor man, eh?" Or a dog barks all night disturbing the whole neighborhood. The policeman is notified; the bureau says: "Yes, yes, it's Mr. So-and-So's dog; we can hardly make a fuss about it."

Another example: I see her still before me, the unhappy woman, every feature showing her corroding cares, her bitter sense of baffled rights, her gnawing anguish. No one would help her. All excused themselves; they had not time; the case was not worth the trouble. Oh! had she been but rich . . . . . then . . . . Small matters, perhaps, but . . . .

The poor have no rights except on paper. The rich are always right—even when they have no rights. The law is brusque with the poor, but before the rich it bends and shuts its eyes. Only the rich dare pay false taxes; if the poor dreams of hiding his little property—woe to him! Influential men's trials drag on year after year to end in an accommodation, but the poor father of a family is clapped into prison with little ceremony.

In the constitution of the State we read about "Equal rights for all." This fine statement is naught but a lie! "Our so-called recognition of the equal natural rights of all men is for great classes of our population nothing but a mockery, and it becomes a more and more bitter deception for larger classes as the social oppression increases, because our institutions do not secure to men the fruits of their labors." (Henry George, *Social Problems*, p. 29.)

We leave it to our readers to study this truth in

the pages of history past and current. Antiquity went down before its baneful force, and it is the secret enemy that is eating out the heart of our modern state.

6.

And morality. Consider how in every age it has exhausted its powers to prove that the existing order was right, how it has ever and always been (heroes, to be sure, have never wholly failed!) the protector of Mammon. It has branded in word theft and adultery, violence and barbarity—but only in general; for it has always had preachers ready to defend the robbery practised by those in power. They have been able to palliate the vices of the powerful, and violence has been called heroism when it was exercised in protecting vested interests. Only the poor have felt the sting of morality's whip. Our preachers are friends of distinguished sinners; they thunder only against the lower classes.

There is one morality for the master and another for the servant; one for the noble, another for the commoner; one for the civilian, another for the soldier. The morality of the Jesuit is not that of the Protestant; the Liberal's differs from the Conservative's. Each makes his own morality according to his position and class. They refer to a common morality only when their common interests are menaced.

We have no morality, only moral standpoints—only moral pretexts for the protection of Mammon. Everybody speaks of morals, meaning by it—their own interests. But morals in league with Mammon

is a lie. And it is this lie that the Social Democrats combat. They deny the validity of "interested" morals—not from motives of immorality but on the contrary from motives of true, independent morality. They are moral in the highest sense because they tear the mask of hypocrisy from the pretended morality of our society.

But whence this interior schism in morality? Why is morality bound to the base interests of Mammon, while intrinsically a holy, absolute power; why to-day sold to transient, sordid interest and to-morrow stirred by the breath of genius to the revelation of the world of perfect spirits?

7.

A man must live. Life means the development of all the powers of being to their richest fulfillment in freedom and power. The Creator gave man this life, and put him in a world of spirit and matter, to use the former as the theater of his freedom, the latter as the theater of his power. But men have ceased to live this life of freedom and power. Matter, which they should control, has got control of them. Therefore men are avaricious, insatiable, self-centered. Men have ceased to live; only matter lives in them.

But withal, men wish to live, to find themselves again. Throughout history they have been returning to themselves like the Prodigal. And the man coming to himself is true morality.

So we have the anomaly—man at once a slave and an aspirant, striving to free himself from the clutches of matter and to realize himself in freedom and power.

There is no real morality in the realms of Mammon, for morality is an attribute of free man, and where man really rules Mammon crouches at his feet. Men talk so much of right and morality. There is only one right—man; only one morality—man.

Within the sphere of Mammon it is simply nonsense to talk of absolute principles of right and morality; it means confusing the question of duty in an insoluble riddle and binding men to an endless slavery to matter.

The Social Democrats do well when they declaim against the current ideas of right and the traditional morality. They are vindicating the only right there really is—the right of *men;* and the only valid morality—the autonomy of the moral consciousness, as Kant called it.

8.

The rights of men! What folly to speak of rights and not think of men! What blindness to talk of mine and thine, instead of I and thou! What weakness to demand obedience from men without seeking the grounds of its authority, to demand morality undisturbed by the fact that it is not possible in a world where material interests rule.

What shall we think of a morality that ranges men alongside of each other as if they were all born in the same conditions, equally strong, equally unprincipled, equally unscrupulous in their means? And yet our law proceeds on this assumption, as if men were a flock of sheep on the same meadow, to be fed on the same pabulum. Can one speak of "right" when the ut-

most brutality is protected by the state and enjoys the greatest triumphs and when the most honorable disposition finds no opportunity for self-expression? Is that "right" which relies solely on human egoism, which proclaims egoism as a principle of social life and sacrifices to it even the means of existence to which every man has a divine right: access to the soil, and the product of labor? Where was the "right" of the Roman patrician, or of the medieval noble; and where is the "right" of the modern proprietor? Ask history how all these "rights" originated, and you will get one answer—through robbery! Robbery is at the basis of our entire jurisprudence, of our landed property, of our financial and industrial system. The soil itself, the basis of everything, belongs to certain privileged persons; the rest are without a country, they have no footing on the land except because the privileged persons need them. And you still speak of Rights!

With what right may a man drive another man from the soil where he is and claim it for himself? Because he has more money? Can he buy off the natural needs of men by money? By what right is gold all-powerful in the state?

You speak of ideas of justice, principles of right and the like. But these are all phrases with which you extenuate the brutality of Mammon. Mammon dictates your books of law.

There is no reason, no law, no real righteousness on earth. There is only one power that rules, comprising the ideal and the mundane in its sway. That power is *money*. He who has money, is right; he who

has none, is wrong. That is the justice of Mammon, and you know no other.

9.

You speak of "rights" in the plural, but the one great fundamental right of men, the right to *live,* you ignore. You say: if a man buys a thing with money, he has a right to that thing, whatever it may be. I will answer you in the words of the great American, Henry George: "The equal, natural and inalienable right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, does it not involve the right of each to the free use of his powers in making a living for himself and his family, limited only by the equal right of all others? Does it not require that each shall be free to make, to save and to enjoy what wealth he may, without interference with the equal rights of others; that no one shall be compelled to give forced labor to another, or to yield up his earnings to another; that no one shall be permitted to extort from another labor or earnings? All this goes without the saying." (Social Problems, Chap. X.)

But if this goes without saying, it likewise goes without saying that it ought not to be possible to acquire with money the possessions which represent for men the indispensable means of production and existence.

Go through the alleys of the poor quarters of our cities; mount the dark and rickety staircases, enter the rooms—mere pens, often—of our poorest workers; observe their miserable existence; bend for a moment over their sick beds, and say if there is not a

fundamental iniquity in our civilization? Are these poor solely culpable for their situation—have not the rest of us helped to put them there? You stammer, "But all have equal rights;" but do you believe it? Surely you do not. You seek in such phrases help against your troubled conscience—a shield from the conviction of an enormous injustice in which you have a part.

How can our Society pose as a defender of right – our Society which, through cancellation of the divine rights of men, has brought about a state of things which provokes crime—our Society which recognizes only Mammon-right, not human-right—our Church which surrounds this Mammon-right with the luster of the divine word?

10.

But you fall on me with the word: The Bible says, "The poor ye have always with you."

It is terrible that you should call to mind the divine word only when it is to legitimize your Mammon. But even so, is it conceivable that the Bible means those words in the sense in which you quote them? That God who has endowed the earth so richly, who has given it to the children of men, has He willed that men should live in daily danger of starvation, only escaping it through serfdom to the rich? That God who has given us the sense of righteousness and brotherhood; shall He recognize the fulfillment of His purpose in the triumphant injustice and cruelty of Mammon?

"Rich and poor meet together;" this, you say, is a

law of nature. But what kind of poor? Those made poor by the oppression and injustice of the rich? Does the same God at once forbid injustice and sanction its fruits? What man, with even half wits, would so act? The poverty of our day, the misery of the masses now, comes from acting contrary to the purpose of the true God. For what is it that *you* understand by "God"? I will tell you. Exactly what the Bible understands by "Mammon." This "God" of yours, who absolves all the cruelties of an unscrupulous egoism with the word—there will always be rich and poor—this God is Mammon. What frightful irony! You call on God's word, and confound it with what Mammon whispers to you between the lines. There may be a poverty that is consistent with God's will, but it is not ours. Our poverty is a shame and a disgrace—a mockery of God's law.

First do away with the injustice you work on your fellowmen, your robbing them of their natural means of living; think again of the original duty of man to man; follow the clear lines of right, the laws of life, that give all a claim to the earth and to the fruits of their labor, and then speak of the inexorable war of competition, of the varying capacities of men, of the laziness that hinders men from rising. Then cite the scripture: "The poor ye have always with you," and you will be able to understand it. Until then you have no right to the words.

II.

No, it must be clear to all that mankind lies under the burden of a frightful wrong, that our economic

system is in complete disobedience to God's will. It is the Social Democrats who see this truth and make it clear. They fight against the laws for the one Law, against the rule of Mammon for the rule of humanity. Instead of "rights" (which generally mean vested iniquities) they demand Right. Their contest against the powers of State and Society is the most moral phenomenon of our time. Their reproach is their glory.

It is said that the Social Democrats propose to reduce everything to a dead level; equal livelihood, equal rights, equal conditions and positions, equal duties—the dull grey equality in which all real life perishes. A cheap and base criticism, the uglier because it tries to saddle the Social Democracy with the very sin the latter seeks to eradicate. It is not true that the Social Democracy demands equal position and outward condition for all men. What it demands is the equal chance for the satisfaction of our life-needs—and this is a demand which springs from the natural rights of human beings, and which indeed is recognized *"in abstracto"* by our civil codes. For middle-class legislation has set up the equality of men as an abstraction, upon the ground of which an inhuman doctrinairism leaves the individual to his fate.

The current claim that we now have equality of opportunity is a lie of Mammon's fashioning to still the public conscience. Whoever studies economics knows well that the "freedom" we hear so much about has no reality. Are the laborers who are bound day in, day out, to their place at the machine, really free, really masters of their lives? Would they sacrifice another moment of their precious lives to the Moloch

of steel if they knew where else to turn? But society bothers little with this actual state of affairs; it reads in its paper constitutions that all men are free and equal before the law, and that is enough. For such a society to accuse the Social Democrats of wishing to fix men in a dull grey uniformity of life is either blindness or hypocrisy.

It is not true that community of production will enslave the individual and rob him of dignity. On the contrary, only when an inviolable order of society vouches for social peace will the individual traits of men and women be free to develop in their completeness, guaranteed by the uniting bond of economic inter-dependence. The Creator has made man for common work, not for an object of doctrinaires' theorizing; it is the privileged classes, anxious for their own position, who see in the common production and sharing of the means of existence the end of all things!

God's laws are pure harmony and joy. "The laws of the Lord are true and righteous altogether. More to be desired are they than gold, yea, than much fine gold; sweeter also than honey and the honeycomb, and in keeping of them there is great reward."

And our laws? Have they been able to prevent wickedness, fraud, evil of all sorts? Have they not often made alliance with these dark powers? Do they not as often serve the inhuman practices of avarice as the quiet and honorable conduct of uprightness? Who is oftenest called to account by them, the poor or the rich, the petty rogue or the great one? Are they not evaded, laughed at, trampled under foot by the favorites of Mammon? Why do men fear the law

only, and not love it? Our justice is injustice; our laws are not laws. They serve Mammon and not man. Justice will for the first time be administered when Justice itself and Law itself—that is to say, Man himself —ascends the throne. But who nurtures such a hope? The Social Democrats.

12.

If the aspect of our present legal institutions is discouraging and painful, our views of morality *per se* ought at least to be elevating. Here, where there is no compulsion, where we are not forced to hamper our ideas of right relations with each other by "considerations" dictated by Mammon, where we may give ourselves in thought freely and fully to our neighbor, we must (so one would think) develop in ourselves and recognize in others the trait which our business life so befogs—our human dignity.

We cannot deny that a mighty current is setting toward the recognition of this postulate in our modern society. More than ever before noble spirits are busying themselves with the questions of morality. We are beginning to understand that morality has its own independent sphere and has nothing to do with Mammon. Not in vain have Kant and his great pupil Fichte followed out the consequences of the Christian doctrine in their demand that men shall be rulers of the kingdom of *things* by virtue of the autonomous moral force within their breasts. To be sure the waves of the faithless, cheerless fatalism, taught by the "realists" of our modern science, are still breaking against the strand of our thought—but they are feebler

than a generation ago. We demand of ourselves with ever increasing insistency: Create thine own world! Our wills are steeling themselves, our faith lifts its head. We fight fatalism with its own weapons when we confidently assert that there is also a necessity compelling us to the good, to freedom, to moral power. And if we inquire closely into the cause of this hopeful change of disposition, we find it to be above all else a reflex of the tremendous energy of the Social Democracy—which is accused of purposing to destroy morality.

We all live to-day by the fresh draught of hope and joy which has blown through our stagnant civilization, stimulating us to the creation of new ideals, opening a future before us—though some traits of that future may be by some fancifully presented. If we contrast the programs of the old parties with what the Social Democrats have set up as their aim, we shall recognize that here if anywhere truth has taken hold and that all the ridicule of enemies and all minor weaknesses of its own cannot destroy a movement which deals earnestly with the ideals of humanity. Why is it then that the Social Democracy is charged with being opposed to morality? It is because its morality is an effective morality, and society's morality is not.

13.

Too much speculative detail in the standard moral publications of to-day, too much calculation, too much anxiety, too much weakness! For what we all need is clear and simple, as it stands on the page of the New Testament: "Love is the fulfilling of the law."

Too much timidity, no *must,* no unconditioned, no fervor!

No *must*—and so in practice the slavery to Mammon goes on. As long as man has not comprehended his own boundless self, his morality must be held captive by a stronger power—matter. Only when man directs his own life does he conquer matter. Morality and life must unite in one power. As long as we think of morality as of a distant power ruling over us, we perpetuate the discord between life and morals and pave the way for the victory of matter over spirit. So long as we say: "Thou shalt!" and do not add: "Because thou art," our life remains an incomprehensible chaos, in whose billows of matter with their counter currents of good so many souls have sunk hopelessly. Behold the riddle of our life: on the one hand the irresistible voice of morality, on the other hand the victory of the senses. But a riddle only so long as we do not know that we ourselves are identical with morality, that we have our very life in morality and that bare moral rules are only the expression of our present incompleteness.

To perpetuate this incompleteness, to say that we cannot grow beyond our present selves, to preserve the chasm between morality and man, to wish to prove that the good is a mere ideal, all this means to defraud men of their highest good and to sacrifice on the altar of Mammon their deepest impulses and their noblest aspirations.

14.

Morals and Mammon, what a frightful alliance! And still that is the seal of our society to-day.

Here is a mother who says to her departing son: "Be upright and honest; God helps the good. The honest always accomplish their aim. You will succeed if you are pious and just." That is to say, morality—for the sake of earthly success. Yet there are other mothers who say: "My son, if you are ridiculed for your principles, never mind; if you have to suffer for your character's sake, do not repent of your choice of the good." But even the heart of this mother is torn to think that harm may befall her child. Fathers and mothers would prefer to have their good children rewarded with "blessing" (i. e., of earthly goods).

We hear the preaching so often: "Love thy neighbor as thyself"—and still we see that the very persons who use these words with so much confidence are seeking their own advantage in money or honors wherever they go. We are bidden to esteem all men with equal honor according to their desert; but everywhere we see subserviency to the rich and condescension to the poor. Despite all the beautiful sermons and books written on the true worth of men, that which we find to be really honored among men is—gold! We may intend to love all men, but we *do* love only the rich.

We do not ignore the fact that there are on all sides, here and there, disinterested men filled with the best intentions; but we must add that they all lack one thing—a strong and effective will. With all their kindly wishes and noble views, they bow before Mammon the inexorable. Their motto is, "as much as possible;" their ever-present idea, "nothing dangerous;" their faith, "things will never be much better." They

speak of good, but they do not know its power; they even become enthusiastic over it, but without that flame which illuminates and kindles. They render it every homage, only not in the realm of reality.

In such circles it is freely admitted that the conditions which produce poverty are undeserved and scandalous. Such men even condemn our system of economics, they admit that our exploitation of the worker is wicked. They say it ought to be different; the poor ought not to have to live by the bare grace of the rich, they ought to have some independence; they ought to, we ought to, the Church ought to, society ought to do this and that. Yes, yes, everybody ought to.

15.

Such an "ought to!" It is morality in Mammon's chains. We talk and talk about it because we cannot *act*. We cover our moral nakedness with these imperatives.

What kind of an "ought" is it that does not discharge itself in a "must"? What kind of morality is that which remains a bare wish? Why do you say: "It should be—but"? Does the good know any "but," any "if," any cowardly calculating considerations? Has not the unconditioned, irresistible good loosed every mighty stream of reform, girded the sword on every champion of righteousness and kindled the tongue of every prophet? The good *must* be, not simply *ought* to be. It alone is real. The world of Mammon is false. The good must be, because it alone is life.

This *must* glows in the souls of the Social Democrats. Hence society accuses them of overthrowing morality. Yes, the philistine morality of Mammon's world they do assail—this weak, mongrel morality that talks of *shoulds* and *oughts,* but knows no *must,* that ever replies when the call comes to *act,* "we cannot change anything!"

Yes, the Social Democrats are enemies of this morality. They cannot calmly prate about meting to each his due, harming none and respecting all, because one great question fills their whole souls; the question, namely, whether the conditions amidst which our Christian charity is so helplessly drifting must not yield to better and juster conditions; the question which makes all our little considerations fade before the one great consideration—regard for mankind.

The endeavor of the Social Democracy is not simply to reach certain economic ideals, but rather to reach human ideals—to deliver man out of the traditional fetters of rusty prejudice and to enable him to take his destiny into his own hands. In the heat of combat this ideal of the Social Democracy is often overlooked. But only read the glowing pages of a Bebel and you will understand the power behind the Social Democracy—not the advantage of one class over another, not stolid hatred against one's more privileged fellow-men, not the prospect of a lazy existence, but the realization of what we all have in us beneath the crust of an inherited past—our humanity. To-day we are not men in the sense the Creator willed when he made man. As long as we are simply striving, each for himself, for the golden dross that matter promises,

so long we miss our true end, and are not men, but beasts. "Only when with full consciousness of our powers we make our own history are we free." Such are the words of a Social Democrat, and such words the current Christianity can brand as utterances of immorality!

Which does God's will herein, Christian or Social Democrat? Should we not give all we have to escape the moral morass of Mammon's service; should we not greet with joy the heroes who have the courage to oppose the slavery of a thousand years in which the Christian Church has languished, to proclaim the Gospel free from all clauses and reservations and to confess a faith which we Christians have long with timid and anxious souls sacrificed to the idols of so-called progress, so-called culture, so-called science?

We repeat again—the Christians have lost their hold on the living God!

16.

Christianity proclaims all men brothers—no slave, no free, no Greek, no Jew; and shall that word have no effect on our social life? How can it be possible—inwardly one, outwardly divided? Must not the inward life always manifest itself in the outward act? Did not the early Christians prove their faith by their community of goods?

But you say: All that may be granted and still we may reply no! to the question whether it is the Social Democracy that has the call and the power to supplant the kingdom of Mammon by the kingdom of personality. So speaks the Church.

But why then, if the Church doubts the power of the Social Democracy, does it not itself set to work? It recognizes the validity of the Social Democratic postulate: deliverance of men from the tyranny of things; only it doubts the power of the Social Democracy. It thinks that for such a work the Christian faith is absolutely necessary. Very well, *why not set to work, you that have the Gospel?* Why only words, words—only negative criticism of the "powerless" Social Democracy? Why talk seriously of the Gospel and its power only when you wish to throw suspicion on your opponents, never when it is a question of yourselves entering the lists to fight against Mammon?

Is *your* Gospel the Gospel of the living God?

17.

But now comes the final, the clinching objection in the cry that the Social Democrats would break up the family. It is said that they contemn the marriage tie and preach free love. This charge is wholly untrue. Bebel's book, "Woman and Socialism," on which the charge is based, is in no sense a deliverance of the party—it is merely the opinion of one man who happens to be high in the party. To make an entire party responsible for what one of its members publishes to the world is an old error. The Social Democracy has never formulated a doctrine of marriage or the family. As little justified as the attempt to foist a dogma of atheism on the party (which distinctly says in its official utterance, "religion is a private matter") is this attempt to make the party stand for an extreme view of one of its leaders. Think what embarrass-

ment Christianity would be in if it were responsible for the private views of many of its most pious saints!

The Social Democrats, as a matter of fact, lead lives irreproachable, according to the moral standards of our day. The principles of the party demand of every member self-conquest and self-sacrifice. The Social Democracy stands in the front rank in the warfare against drunkenness and against prostitution. This party is, in truth, one of the strongest agencies for morality. And how could it be otherwise?

How could a movement which has aims so lofty be other than a purifying force? A movement which puts man in his right place as supreme over things cannot but make for morality, even in the ordinary sense. The Social Democracy does indeed say: "Justice and morality are subject to mutability;" but it says this in the light of a future in which all laws and prescriptions, both inner and outer, are swallowed up in *life*. Is this hope a true one, or is it the fever dream of error? Let the Christian consult his Bible.

18.

"And there shall come forth a shoot out of the stock of Jesse, and a branch out of his roots shall bear fruit: and the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord; and his delight shall be in the fear of the Lord: and he shall not judge after the sight of his eyes, neither reprove after the hearing of his ears: but with righteousness shall he judge the poor, and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth: and he

shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked. And righteousness shall be the girdle of his loins, and faithfulness the girdle of his reins. And the wolf shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain: for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea." (Isaiah 11, 1-9.)

"And I will give them one heart and one way, that they may fear me forever; for the good of them, and of their children after them: and I will make an everlasting covenant with them, that I will not turn away from them, to do them good; and I will put my fear in their hearts, that they shall not depart from me." (Jeremiah 32, 39-40.)

"A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you: and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh. And I will put my spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments and do them. And ye shall be my people and I will be your God." (Ezekiel 36, 26-28.)

"For as many as are of the works of the law are under a curse: for it is written, Cursed is every one which continueth not in all things that are written in the book of the law, to do them. Now that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God is evident: for, the righteous shall live by faith; and the law is not of faith, for, He that doeth them shall live in them.

Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us: that upon the Gentiles might come the blessing of Abraham in Christ Jesus; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith. So that the law hath been our tutor, to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But now that faith is come, we are no longer under a tutor. For ye are all sons of God, through faith in Jesus Christ. There can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male nor female: for ye are all one man in Christ Jesus." (Gal. 3.)

"For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus made me free from the law of sin and of death." (Romans 8, 2.)

CHAPTER VIII.

"THE SOCIAL DEMOCRACY KNOWS NO FATHERLAND."

Let us finally consider the reproach made by all parties against the Social Democrats that they seek to destroy patriotism and nationality, that in their dream of a phantom internationalism they trample under foot the holiest of all things, the love of fatherland.

1.

This is a serious reproach in these days when the sense of nationality is so strong, when the nations have paralyzed each other's powers in the development of their own means of defence. But the longer peace lasts, the more the nations are learning of each other and the more criminal seems a devastating war. More and more to-day the opinion is gaining ground that a nation is not fulfilling its true destiny when it extends its borders and gives free play to the barbarous idea that its own prosperity must be built on the ruins of the neighboring lands. So patriotism to-day goes hand in hand with a growing toleration of other peoples. In fact, no people wants war. Only through mistrust—a mistrust born on the battlefields of the last century—do nations still clash in arms. The day will come, we hope, when we shall all realize that true civilization means living side by side with other nations in peace.

2.

Now is it this picture of universal brotherhood that the Social Democrats wish to destroy? Do they stamp

down the flowers of the various national cultures in the gardens of the world? Or are they the very party of all parties which upholds universal peace? Hear the words of one of the apologists of the Social Democracy: "The sympathy for oppressed peoples and the lively desire to support them in their battle for rights and independence is one of the noblest traits of the Social Democracy. Whether it is the question of a people like the Poles, who long ago lost their nationality and became merged in other nations, or of smaller peoples like the Armenians and Cretans, who never have constituted a political organization, whose demands extend no further than to elementary guarantees for the safety of life and property, or of the Jews, oppressed by the race-hatred of their fellow citizens—everywhere the Social Democrats will be found on the side of the persecuted." (Issaieff, *"Socialism and Public Life,"* p. 334.)

There are two kinds of patriotism. One is the sort that is born and dies within the nation and never thinks that a nation's ideals can be best realized by a sympathetic understanding of other peoples. Such is the miserable patriotism of the chauvinist. The other sort is no less kindled with love of fatherland, but it never fails to appreciate and respect the aspirations of other peoples. And it is the Social Democrats above all others who recognize and cultivate this better kind of patriotism.

3.

Whoever attempts to defend a great idea finds himself at times in a false position—whether by his own

fault or by that of others. By his own fault, when he fails in clearness through impetuosity, when he expects that others will understand him at once, even in matters that require concentrated thought. In such case he often makes it appear that the New, which he is advocating with all the ardor of his soul, is in fierce irreconcilable opposition to the Old. A chasm opens up, where a sensible and conciliatory way of presenting the truth would have shown a real continuity. This has sometimes been the experience of the Social Democrats in their way of presenting the question of nationality. They have at times excited the most obstinate misunderstanding by their passionate and unguarded phraseology.

But if they have been at fault, how much more guilty have been their adversaries! What can be more odious than with set purpose to refuse to understand, to pick out extreme phrases in the exuberant language of some Social Democrats, and then to persistently affirm that in urging internationalism the Social Democrats mean that all peoples shall be forced into one mould—precisely the evil they strive against.

Doubtless the Social Democrats do stand for internationalism; they hold that every man should more and more think internationally. Have their critics forgotten that there is an international misery, an international oppression of the poor by the rich? Poverty—is it a national or an international condition? The German may feel differently from the Frenchman, the Englishman differently from the Russian; but the poor in these lands are not French-poor or Russian-poor. Hunger knows no Fatherland; misery remains misery,

suffering and need change not, whether the eagle of the Empire or the tricolor of France wave over them. The Social Democrats must feel "internationally," because they feel with the oppressed.

4.

But just here rises the conflict of conscience for whose inevitableness the Social Democrats are specially blamed. Must citizens of a country, for the sake of their country's advancement at the cost of another country, approve of the laws and measures which ruin the poor? Must the English approve of the spoliation of the South African Republic because it adds some thousand square miles to England's realm? Shall the German citizen swell with pride when German soldiers in China stir up a war against a people the great majority of whom are responsible for no harm? Must not the Russian of fine sensibilities feel it a disgrace and an outrage when the struggling Finn is trampled on by Russian legions?

What kind of patriotism is it that builds on the ruins of the freedom of another people, and that greets with joy every wicked deed, if it only happens under the flag of the "fatherland"? What is it but brutality? Whose heart does not shudder before the hideous spectacle that the great powers show us; on the one hand mad preparations for war, and on the other powerlessness to cope with the distress of impoverished populations? Hundreds of thousands of men must die in suffering because the powers whose combined word could stop it all—are afraid of each other.

What kind of colonial policy is it that profits only

the capitalists, and where "progress" is attained through the blood of thousands of natives ruthlessly slaughtered? Is not the patriotism which welcomes such things rather the relic of a brutal age when men were all on the defensive against each other—all alike barbarians? Who dare call himself Christian and yet condemn such questions?

Questions like these have come to stay.

To-day the interests of mankind are beginning to take precedence of the interests of states. There is something more than home and fatherland—man, yes, even bushman and negro. Thanks neither to Church nor state, radical nor conservative, but to the Social Democrats alone, we all feel to-day the truth of the assertion: True patriotism is that which regards the freedom of all peoples as well as that of one's own; even as it is true that no citizen is truly free while there remains a slave, so it is true that no people is free until all are redeemed from oppression.

5.

But before this patriotism can win the field the arch enemy must be driven out. Without the destruction of capitalism, true patriotism can not exist. The capitalists have prostituted patriotism to the selfish demands of Mammon for protection and extension of markets. Have all the soldiers who left wife and child to spill their blood on foreign battle fields fallen for their country or only for their rich countrymen? Is it not the fact that our governments go hand in hand with capital and treat with it as one great power with another? Do they not ever lend willing ears to

capitalist proposals, but dull and unwilling ears to any plan for the bettering of the workers' conditions?

And can a patriotism which allies itself with Mammon be genuine? All the bitterness which such an alliance occasions among the masses—can it serve to nurture true love of country? The Social Democracy cries to the rulers: Make the interests of the poor the task of your country's devotion, love the real supporters of the fatherland and you will see that you have for the first time insured the safety and strength of your land. Do away with the false cosmopolitanism of capitalism and you will see that the true cosmopolitanism, the love of man for his fellow man, is quite consistent with the autonomy of the various states and with the love of men for their country. Patriotism is morally won and indefeasibly kept only when it is permeated with the purifying element of a realized brotherhood of man.

6.

Now if this creed is marvelous in the eyes of men of the world, those who regard life as too complicated, too inscrutable, too "practical," to justify our opening such wide perspectives—why should we not at least see those take their stand on the side of the Social Democratic faith and hope whose own confession should place them there—the Christians? How can Christians speak of the "folly" of the international faith of the Social Democrats? How can Stoecker speak of the Social Democrats' "hatred of their fatherland"? How could Naumann name his Christian Social party "National Social"? Is there one attitude

of which Christians should be more ashamed than this? Do not Christians know that as disciples of the Savior they should be men of hope, men of the future and so men of a cosmopolitan view?

To believe in the words of the Bible means to expect the Kingdom of God, and this Kingdom comprises all mankind. To be a Christian means to live in the great hope that God will be all in all.

But Christianity seems to have forgotten all that. This hope is at most the closing paragraph in its clever dogmatics. It is no longer truly "hopes" or "awaits." It is lost in the world. It has no living God!

On the other hand, the Social Democracy is international, "homeless." It is inspired by the thought of one common humanity. And herein it follows the Bible—the religious guide of the Christian!

CHAPTER IX.

ALL THINGS MUST BECOME NEW.

Jesus made all things new. It might be that this new state was to come immediately into being or it might be that it was to be developed in a long and painful evolution. The former way was the hope of the early Christians, the latter way has proved to be the fact. It is no part of our duty to discuss the wherefore of this. But we maintain that, in spite of all, the early Christians were not deceived in the main thing, and that the long, painful history through which the Kingdom of God must come takes away nothing from its quality of *newness*.

And the best spirits of to-day are really beginning to believe in the possibility of a new world. They feel that the old moral and religious categories are no longer valid; that they have served their day and have become mere phrases. Men are longing for a new world of righteousness, in which Mammon is truly overcome. In other words, they are beginning to understand what was originally meant by the words "Kingdom of God"—something wholly new!

Jesus had an eternal, unchanging *must* within him, the compulsion of divine love. And this same compulsion moves the Social Democracy. The truth was spoken by that Social Democrat who said: "He who has not the spirit does not understand our cause." What the Social Democracy has in common with the Gospel is not single debatable measures and rules, but

a great irresistible *must,* in the faith of which it announces a new order.

The Living God makes men great, free and broad. Whoever has Him comprehends all things, suffers all things, believes all things, hopes all things. He has no mean thoughts, he holds himself apart from nothing.

The activities of men are endlessly complex; lives of folly are tangled with lives of wisdom in almost inextricable confusion. There is a feverish movement in humanity, apparently without sense or plan. It testifies that men will to live; that stagnation is death; that life is progression. But the advance is over ruins, over the graves of the dead: each advance wrestles arduously for its right to be, against an uncomprehending present. Man is compelled to destroy; the consuming flames of denial blaze up within him. He destroys that he may live; he destroys because *he must.*

And through all men's agitations and struggles runs one great thought: the consciousness that their agony and effort are not in vain, that they are bringing mankind ever nearer the goal of truth. He who knows in his heart the living God knows that man will conquer in the end. He sees the confusion—but beyond it—peace. He sees the folly—but beyond it—light. He does not look with the eyes of the dreamer, chasing a phantasy of his own creation. No. Life is real to him. God's name is not an empty word for him to serve the official cult of a piety in Mammon's interest; not a weapon for a party controversy in theology; not a scientific sciolism tossed about in the

winds of metaphysical dogmas. No, he knows and has his God. God lives!

How shall he express this tremendous truth that swells within his breast? How shall he communicate this great secret to a lost world? What are words, stammering, halting words? Not words, but deeds, can express *Him Who Is*. To do—and to do means faith. One thing alone is needful, to hold fast to the reality of God; not to believe in evil, in sin, in darkness—but to believe in *men* always and everywhere, even when they stumble and err. To believe in their divine possibilities and capabilities, to believe the light in them. Forward, to meet the living God!

God gave his Church a living word. The Church has corrupted it to self-righteous piety, ceremony and dogma. It toys with God. It pretends devotion; it plays hide and seek with God's promises; it acts as if its dogmas were the rules of the Kingdom of God; it keeps back the Gospel in its artificial formulae.

Then the waters of God burst through the walls of this dam of self-righteousness, and, led by strangers to the Church and its dogmas, these fructifying waters spread over the parched meadows of humanity. Others must preach what the Church should preach, others set in motion the forces which the Church should call out, others proclaim that truth which is hidden behind the Church's creeds.

For it is the Social Democracy which now demands Righteousness—truthfulness in outward relations, better conditions, sounder bodies, lighter dwellings, co-operative production. It says: What lives and creates

must appear in *outward* results. Theories and pious reflections will not avail. Let us see results, not simply "new hearts"! Hearts are new only when conditions are new.

Is the Social Democracy not right? Dare the Church with its own one-sided worship of "spirit" reproach it with one-sidedness?

That divine *must,* born of eternity, which the Church has buried in silence under the temptations of worldly ease, drives on the Social Democracy. It cries to all the world. All things must, they *must* become new! It wakes the masses, it rebukes, threatens, promises. The Church cries, Revolution! But it is only the bursting into power of the truth of the Gospel.

Who to-day understands that old word of the Creator: "Subdue the earth," the Church or the Social Democracy? When the latter restores "matter" to its place of honor, and predicts a future commonwealth in which all who labor shall be happy, what else is it doing but giving new expression to the original happy faith in the goodness of God's creation? Was not this God's mind when He gave the earth to men? And when the Church maintains that the Social Democracy is godless in its materialism, is it not plain that the Church has herself missed the way of the living God?

Our law and morals must yield to a higher order —so say the Social Democrats, and the words are interpreted as an attack on the most sacred values of life. But a glance into the Bible will tell us that these

words are only the expression of God's purpose with the world.

The Social Democrats are derided as "men without a country," because they believe in a brotherhood of mankind and oppose the chauvinistic "patriotism" of the capitalists. But who has better interpreted the word of the Lord: "As I live, the whole earth shall be filled with my glory."

Grand, noble, true, necessary is the work of the Social Democracy. In it God's promises are coming to fulfillment. The Social Democrats are spreading abroad His truth, for—*they must.*

THE LIST OF SUSTAINERS

The Co-Operative Printing Company desires to express grateful appreciation of the generous terms upon which Rev. Hermann Kutter transferred the American rights to this extraordinary book; of the liberality and tireless labors of Rufus W. Weeks, who furnished and revised the translation and read final proofs, and of the assistance of each and every one of the following who have paid in advance for one or more copies of the book, thus enabling us to publish it without difficulty or debt.

It is a real honor to have helped in putting forth such a notable and serviceable volume—a lasting memorial of a noble deed for the cause of Socialism which you may show your children and friends with a worthy pride—and, as this is our first effort at publishing a full-fledged book, we shall remember with peculiar gratitude each one of the Sustainers, or Assistant Publishers, whose names appear below:

The following have paid for the number of copies set opposite their names:

	Copies.
Wm. C. Chandler, Schenectady, N. Y.	45
O. G. Roedel, Silverton, Colo.	30
Rufus W. Weeks, New York City, N. Y.	15
Rev. E. E. Carr, Chicago, Ill.	15
George Foster Peabody, Lake George, N. Y.	15
Geo. Hogg, Upland, Calif.	9
Dr. C. H. Reed, Toledo, O.	9
Hervey Johnson, Wichita, Kan.	7

The following have paid for six copies:

Eugene Aldrich, Wauseon, O.
Arthur Bassett, Fargo, N. Dak.
Rev. Frank Blessing, Collegeville, Pa.
A. D. Cady, Marshalltown, Ia.
Robt. Dodge, Portsmouth, O.

Mrs. Fannie E. Deuser, Hazelton, Kans.
John Evans, Massillon, O.
Dr. J. H. Glass, South Fork, Pa.
Rev. H. W. Greetham, Orlando, Fla.
John T. Gulick, Honolulu, Hawaii.
V. P. Hyden, La Gloria, Cuba.
Adam Lensch, Dayton, Ohio.
C. F. Nesbit, Washington, D. C.
David Rousseau, Ossining, N. Y.
J. Everett Seely, Salt Lake City, Utah.
Thos. Wilkinson, Nanaimo, B. C., Can.

The following have paid for four copies:

Margaret Vater Longley, S. Pasadena, Calif.
J. E. Walton, Sturgis. Mich.

The following have paid for three copies:

F. L. Allen, Dayton, O.
W. D. Altman, Shelocta, Pa.
Chas. R. Arndt, Jersey City, N. J.
J. C. Aschenbeck, Wharton, Tex.
Prof. and Mrs. F. E. Ashburn, Nucla, Colo.
J. H. Atkins, Pasco, Wash.
Theo. Atworth, Springfield, Mass.
Mrs. H. C. Babbitt, Lockland, Ohio.
L. J. Baker, Sawtelle, Calif.
Peter Baker, St. Augustine, Fla.
H. L. Baker, Puyallup, Wash.
Nellie L. Bangert, Buffalo, N. Y.
Karl Baron, Joliet, Ill.
G. W. Beauchamp, Wichita, Kans.
John Beehler, Brooklyn, N. Y.
L. Belkowitz, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Rev. J. O. Bentall, Chicago, Ill.
C. G. Wm. Benn, Hancock, Minn.
C. H. Bennett, Battleford, Sask., Can.
Mrs. L. Bernrenter, Mt. Olive, Ill.
B. F. Bickerstaff, Bellvue, Colo.
W. P. Bickley, Farmersville, Tex.
B. Frank Bierly, Vilas, Pa.
Fred Bippert, Buffalo, N. Y.
Andrew Bishop, Vinita, Okla.
Wm. Blank, Ridgefield, Wash.
Oscar H. Blase, Wichita, Kans.
H. B. Blair, Langley, Wash.
John Blakeley, West Chicago, Ill.

J. S. Borden, La Mesa, Calif.
Amor Boyd, Montpelier, Ind.
Prof. H. P. Bonny, Hamilton, Ont., Can.
Harry P. Bosson, Reading, Mass.
Jos. A. Bray, Montrose, Colo.
L. T. Brown, Spencer, N. C.
David H. Brown, E. Point, Fla.
Rev. Harvey Dee Brown, Milwaukee, Wis.
Marion C. Brown, Perry, Okla.
Harvey J. Brower, Battleford, Sask., Can.
N. S. Burgess, West Plains, Mo.
C. H. Bungay, Spokane, Wash.
Mrs. Louise Cajanus, Chicago, Ill.
David Calkins, Gainesville, Tex.
A. G. Callender, Arnold, Pa.
Mrs. Ella Carr, Chicago, Ill.
Grant Chapin, Green, Kans.
H. Chilcote, Trough Creek, Pa.
A. L. Clampit, Mt. Vernon, Mo.
W. W. Clark, Egypt, Okla.
G. S. Gulick Clark, Riverside, Calif.
Charles P. Collier, Altamont, Kans.
Rev. A. J. Collison, Homestead, Pa.
Mrs. E. B. Cooke, Brooklyn, N. Y.
C. M. Cronk, Montfort, Wis.
Edw. and Martha Croushore, Fayette City, Pa.
Dr. J. S. Crow, Chicago, Ill.
Roy Crosby, Litchfield, Minn.
John M. Crook, Chicago, Ill.
W. J. Curry, Vancouver, B. C., Can.
Jas. Davis, Milwaukee, Wis.
G. H. Damrow, Fond du Lac, Wis.
W. E. Davies, Green, Kans.
Wheeler P. Davey, Cleveland, Ohio.
Geo. H. DeGrief, Colville, Wash.
C. R. Dennison, Youngstown, Ohio.
Eugene V. Debs, Girard, Kans.
Rev. W. de Rondin-Pos, San Francisco, Calif.
C. M. Dickinson, Falconer, N. Y.
John Donaldson, Reading, Pa.
W. R. S. Dodds, Vanderbilt, Mich.
Agnes H. Downing, Los Angeles, Calif.
J. O. Duckett, Hemet, Calif.
Benj. Eefting, Chicago, Ill.
M. Enevoldsen, Waverly, N. Y.
C. A. Engel, Byesville, O.

O. A. Fairchild, Silver Creek, N. Y.
Prof. Chas. P. Fagnani, New York City, N. Y.
Mrs. J. H. Fellows, Spearfish, S. Dak.
Mrs. Nora E. Ferrell, Erie, Pa.
May Coghlan Fitzpatrick, Brooklyn, N. Y.
F. Fenstermaker, Berwick, Pa.
I. N. Fitzpatrick, Star City, Sask., Can.
G. A. Forsgard, Houston, Tex.
J. S. Freeman, Kenwood, N. Y.
Rev. E. M. Frank, Philadelphia, Pa.
A. W. Frederick, North Fork, Calif.
Jos. D. Fraivillig, Schenectady, N. Y.
Rev. E. T. R. Fripp, White City, Fla.
A. J. Gant, McMinnville, Ore.
Belle W. Gault, Morse, La.
J. Lew Gardner, Leon, Ia.
Lester Geer, Aberdeen, S. Dak.
Daniel O. Gittings, Pittsburg, Pa.
Prof. A. N. Gilbertson, Willmar, Minn.
Arthur H. Gleason, New York City, N. Y.
John Govan, Sequim, Wash.
B. M. Gordon, Brooklyn, N. Y.
W. E. Godsey, Los Angeles, Calif.
Mr. and Mrs. Geo. H. Goebel, Newark, N. J.
Aug. Graunke, Milwaukee, Wis.
Mrs. Mathilda Grote, Evansville, Ind.
Wm. C. Green, Pacific Grove, Calif.
H. A. Guerth, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Raymond Otis Hanna, New York City, N. Y.
C. B. Guthrie, Greensboro, N. C.
Scott Haines, Freeport, Pa.
Wm. J. F. Hannemann, Chicago, Ill.
F. R. Hannemann, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Wm. L. Havenstrite, New York City, N. Y.
Leon A. Hall, Boscawen, N. H.
E. J. Harley, Los Angeles, Calif.
Ernest Hamel, Hazelmere, B. C., Can.
Mr. and Mrs. S. A. Hallberg, Ross Creek, Alta., Can.
Samuel Hanson, Meeting Creek, Alta., Can.
Edward Herms, Glassport, Pa.
Mr. and Mrs. F. W. Hill, Buffalo, N. Y.
T. J. Hinton, Tulare, Calif.
C. C. Hitchcock, Ware, Mass.
Wm. Higginbottom, Creelsboro, Ky.
F. W. Hirt, Erie, Pa.
John J. Hodgins, Schenectady, N. Y.

Harvey Hollenbeck, Kingston, N. Y.
Rev. Oliver C. Horsman, Morristown, N. J.
Rev. N. S. Hoagland, Tyngsboro, Mass.
S. L. Hoover, Knoxville, Tenn.
C. J. Hoffman, Mansfield, O.
Solomon Hoxie, Chicago, Ill.
M. L. Huddleston, Jacksonville, Tex.
Jas. Hummel, Gloversville, N. Y.
E. H. Hummel, Port Stanley, Wash.
Rev. and Mrs. Alexander Irvine, New York City, N. Y.
J. W. Jackson, E. Liverpool, O.
A. M. Jerauld, Chattanooga, Tenn.
David J. Jenkins, Cambridge, O.
Jesse R. Johnson, Clay Center, O.
J. S. Jones, Copeville, Tex.
Mrs. Mariette L. Johnson, Fairhope, Ala.
Edw. Karley, Chesley, Ont., Can.
Rev. Alex. Kent, Washington, D. C.
A. G. Ketchum, Petersburg, Alaska.
Geo. A. Kelly, Hotchkiss, Colo.
S. A. Keep, Jennings, La.
D. W. Kennedy, Du Quoin, Ill.
R. H. Kirkpatrick, Drew, Ore.
Dr. J. A. Kirkpatrick, Chicago, Ill.
Jas. Kimmel, Bayfield, Colo.
Ralph L. Kline, Youngstown, O.
Fred Krumsick, Nashville, Ill.
A. Kuppinger, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. J. Tamblin, Spokane, Wash.
G. M. Larson, Rockford, Ill.
N. W. Lermond, Thomaston, Me.
Dr. Geo. N. Lemmer, Spooner, Wis.
E. S. Lowe, Drain, Ore.
Rev. John D. Long, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Edwin F. Ludwig, Washington, D. C.
Robert Lynn, Newark, N. J.
F. H. Marsh, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Wm. Maxwell, Gloversville, N. Y.
Alex. MacKinnon, Glace Bay, N. S., Can.
Wm. MacKinnon, Glace Bay, N. S., Can.
John Y. Mardick, Charleston, Mo.
Rev. R. H. MacPherson, Marble Mountain, N. S., Can.
W. F. Maywald, Hartley, Ia.
O. F. Mallory, Fremont, Ind.
J. F. Massey, Douglas, Ariz.
Mrs. S. W. McClellan, Grand Rapids, Mich.

W. H. McFall, West Concord, N. H.
John J. McKay, New Glasgow, N. S., Can.
Dr. C. W. McDade, Ceylon, Minn.
I. D. McFadden, Paonia, Colo.
A. McMullan, Dominion, C. B., Can.
Rev. Walter H. McPherson, Chicago, Ill.
W. P. Metcalf, Albuquerque, N. Mex.
Mrs. K. L. M. Meserole, Bellport, L. I., N. Y.
J. B. Meredith, Reed Springs, Mo.
Fred E. Miller, Grand Junction, Mich.
M. Misere, Burton City, Ohio.
Atty. Wm. H. Morgan, Aberdeen, S. Dak.
H. P. Moyer, Chicago, Ill.
Wm. M. Morgan, Fortuna, Calif.
Rev. S. W. Motley, Twin Falls, Ida.
Dr. Wm. Moore, New Albany, Ind.
S. Mori, Newton Center, Mass.
Chas. K. Musgrove, Scottdale, Pa.
Richard L. Munn, Hollis, Okla.
J. W. Murphy, Murphy, Ia.
C. C. Nelson, Hamilton, Mont.
Varner Nelson, Sheldon, Ia.
Miss Blanche Nesmith, Springfield, Mo.
Rev. A. Noll, McKeesport, Pa.
C. E. Obenchain, Greenville, Tex.
Tobias S. Ochs, Reinholds Sta., Pa.
S. Oian, Erskim, Minn.
C. H. Owen, Harvey, Ill.
Paul J. Paulsen, Rock Springs, Wyo.
Lyman Payne, Evanston, Wyo.
Dr. Levi Parker, Boston, Mass.
Mrs. Lulu E. Pennybacker, Vienna, W. Va.
Chas. G. Pease, M. D., New York City, N. Y.
R. G. Penn, Sr., Altus, Okla.
Joe Pevril, Piedmont, Mo.
A. J. Pettigrew, Manatee, Fla.
John A. Peterson, Evanston, Ill.
F. Pfeiffer, Oshkosh, Wis.
Geo. Pfeifley, Green, Kan.
Local Pfafftown, Geo. F. Wilson, Sec., Pfafftown, N. C.
Martin Luzerne Phares, Grand Ledge, Mich.
W. H. Pitt, Burson, Calif.
G. H. Poor, Milwaukee, Wis.
J. H. Pride, Amherst, S. Dak.
J. P. Pickens, Letart, W. Va.
A. C. Price, Renfrew, Pa.

Rev. W. A. Prosser, McKees Rocks, Pa.
D. Pratt, Porterville, Calif.
J. J. Prater, Dennison, Tex.
John F. Putnam, Danvers, Mass.
J. Quick, Coquille, Ore.
Wm. H. Ramsay, Derwent, O.
D. W. Rankin, Jennings, La.
Rand School: W. J. Ghent, Rosa Laddon, New York City.
Gustave Reiche, Seattle, Wash.
A. W. Reed, Illinois City, Ill.
C. E. Reeves, Benton Harbor, Mich.
Robt. B. Ringler, Reading, Pa.
Harry S. Richards, Chicago, Ill.
J. C. Riechers, Twin Falls, Ida.
Wm. Rosser, Nanticoke, Pa.
D. F. Romig, Williamsport, Pa.
J. W. Robertson, M. D., Hotchkiss, Colo.
E. Rosinquist, Cambridge, Minn.
Rev. C. H. Rogers, Hutchinson, Kans.
R. Antione Rogers, New Orleans, La.
J. B. Rutherford, San Dimas, Calif.
J. H. Ryckman, Atty., Evanston, Wyo.
W. L. Sax, Colville, Wash.
Chris. Sauers, Erie, Pa.
Joseph Saunders, Saginaw, Mich.
Saugus Socialist Club, C. H. Townsend, Saugus, Mass.
John Schonborn, Las Cruces, N. Mex.
H. L. Schell, Washington, D. C.
Wm. Scott, Villisca, Ia.
W. H. Sergeant, Newark, N. J.
J. W. Shaw, Milburn, Okla.
T. J. Shenton, Nanaimo, B. C., Can.
S. L. Shorthill, Wakeeney, Kans.
Mrs. H. L. Sieghartner, Rock Island, Ill.
Lauren P. Smith, Warren, Ohio.
Myron D. Smith, Nashville, Ill.
Rev. Jas. L. Smiley, Annapolis, Md.
Chas. W. Smiley, Baltimore, Md.
Geo. L. Spencer, Providence, R. I.
Mrs. M. A. Spurgeon, Waco, Texas.
E. F. Stanton, Memphis, Tex.
L. M. Sterns, Humboldt, Neb.
W. J. Standley, Chicago, Ill.
Geo. H. Strobell, Newark, N. J.
Rose Pastor Stokes, Stamford, Conn.
J. G. Phelps Stokes, Stamford, Conn.

S. A. Stowe, Coeur D'Alene, Ida.
Chas. J. St. John, Toronto, Ont., Can.
Rev. O. O. Sundberg, Nashville, Tenn.
A. G. Swanson, San Diego, Calif.
Taylor Bros., Winston Salem, N. C.
A. J. Taylor, Douglas, Ariz.
H. F. Thomas, Providence, R. I.
Charles E. Thompson, Arleta, Ore.
Rev. Thos. J. Thompson, Pekin, Ill.
R. L. Thomson, Toronto, Ont., Can.
Geo. H. Townsend, Dundas, Ont., Can.
John Van De Lester, Kalamazoo, Mich.
Dr. H. J. Von Lackum, Dysart, Ia.
Ohannes Varshag, Denver, Colo.
R. L. Wainwright, Egan, La.
J. J. Wall, Centerville, Iowa.
P. A. Wanless, Cresco, Ia.
Frank W. Warthorst, Bakersfield, Calif.
J. J. Wasmer, Green, Kans.
John L. Way, Tulare, Calif.
Rev. R. M. Webster, Elmonte, Calif.
F. Weber, Peotone, Ill.
Mrs. Jos. Weisenberger, Porterville, Calif.
Albert Weigle, Brooklyn, N. Y.
J. K. Wellman, Leavenworth, Kan.
T. B. Wells, Aberdeen, S. Dak.
Rev. and Mrs. Eliot White, Worcester, Mass.
F. R. Whipple, Auburn, N. Y.
S. Willcoxon, Minneapolis, Kan.
Ivan R. Winters, Bellingham, Wash.
J. M. Woodcock, Sioux, Neb.
Rev. T. W. Woodrow, Hobart, Okla.
James F. Woods, Groton, Mass.
Mattie and Bessie M. Womsley, Allegheny, Pa.
Mrs. J. H. Yocum, Darby, Pa.
P. H. Zender, Austin, Minn.

The following have paid for one copy:

Chas. E. Allen, Harrisonville, Mo.
Wm. F. Anderson, Mankato, Minn.
W. A. Arnold, Milwaukee, Wis.
Thomas Ashmore, New Wilmington, Pa.
J. C. Ayres, Kansas City, Kan.
C. Bangs, Savannah, Ga.
J. W. Barnett, Sedalia, Mo.
A. W. Beach, Sheldon, Iowa.

O. G. Beito, Effington, S. Dak.
Mrs. F. H. Benner, Campbell, Calif.
C. T. Bent, New Glasgow, N. S., Can.
T. H. B. Bodenhamer, Sparta, Mo.
W. E. Boynton, Ashtabula, O.
L. L. Brande, Pittsburg, Pa.
Edwin A. Brenholtz, Turnersville, Tex.
John H. Bullard, Schuylerville, N. Y.
Rev. Thos. P. Byrnes, Erie, Pa.
E. F. Christian, Alta, Ia.
A. B. Clinch, Butte, Mont.
M. E. Connell, De Pass, Wyo.
C. N. Cornelius, Newberg, Ore.
Rev. Sidney Herbert Cox, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Dr. A. T. Cuzner, Gilmore, Fla.
L. Dennis, Altamont, Kans.
J. H. Dennison, Hubbard, O.
H. E. Dye, Visalia, Calif.
Foster Ellis, Chicago, Ill.
Oscar B. Fenn, Jersey City, N. J.
S. K. Fleming, Montgomery, Ala.
Dr. A. F. Green, Cleveland, Ohio.
R. E. Goslin, Arnold, Pa.
John M. Hansen, Clinton, Ia.
Thos. Hickling, Jacksonville, Fla.
Rev. W. C. Hopkins, Toledo, Ohio.
Rev. M. L. Howe, Belding, Mich.
Rev. John Brewster Hubbs, Geneva, N. Y.
August Huck, Newburgh, Ind.
Alvin Huff, Easton, Pa.
August H. Hunholz, Milwaukee, Wis.
C. L. Hurlbut, Ithaca, N. Y.
Rev. Wm. S. Jackson, Brooklyn, N. Y.
John C. Jensen, Malad City, Ida.
Robt. E. A. Lansdowne, 372 E. 72d St., New York City, N. Y.
T. A. Leasure, E. Des Moines, Ia.
C. P. Lee, Arkansas City, Kan.
Herm. Lehmkuhl, Milwaukee, Wis.
Joseph Lentz, Struthers, Ohio.
E. E. Lindblad, Ely, Minn.
C. Loehwing, Chicago, Ill.
A. L. McFarlane, Freewater, Ore.
E. N. McGary, Maple Plain, Minn.
J. H. McKalip, Rew, Pa.
C. D. McLaughlin, Milan, Ill.
August Melin, West Duluth, Minn.

Ross J. Miller, North English, Ia.
Mrs. M. E. Montgomery, Madison, Ill.
Eli Moorhouse, Vernon, B. C., Can.
Mrs. B. H. Noxon, Ithaca, N. Y.
E. I. Palmer, Brooklyn, N. Y.
R. Pease, Filer, Ida.
J. W. Peebles, Leesville, Tex.
Clyde Radcliffe, Madison, Ind.
Henry Redman, Hillsboro, Kans.
Henry H. Rowland, Lima, N. Y.
Jacob Rufi, Chanute, Kans.
C. S. Scheffler, Reading, Pa.
John Schneider, Paradise Valley, Nev.
T. B. Southall, Amarillo, Tex.
Edith A. Spear, St. Petersburg, Fla.
J. B. Smith, Saxon, N. C.
Miss M. Stull, Albuquerque, N. Mex.
Theo. Thorson, Forest City, Ia.
M. C. Tipton, Breckenridge, Tex.
Charles Todd, Arkansas City, Kans.
J. Willis Tonkin, Trenton, N. J.
John Tullett, Greensburg, Kans.
O. T. Turner, McKinney, Texas.
Dr. Van Pelt, Montgomery, Ala.
W. F. Vroom, New York City, N. Y.
Geo. A. Wake, Los Angeles, Cal.
J. W. Waffensmith, Espanola, N. Mex.
Rev. Wm. A. Ward, Arrow Rock, Mo.
Wm. H. Warfield, Franklinville, Md.
Dr. P. M. Webster, Long Beach, Calif.
C. R. Williamson, West Chester, Pa.
A. Wilson, Englewood, Colo.
Clayton F. Woods, Bakersfield, Calif.
Mrs. A. M. Worden, Kenwood, N. Y.

THE BEST THINGS TO READ

The Christian Socialist, a handsome eight-page paper, issued twice a month, devoted to genuine Christianity and Scientific Socialism. Everyone interested in human betterment should read it. Only 50 cents per year. Address, 5623 Drexel Avenue, Chicago.

What the Christian Socialists Stand For, by Rufus W. Weeks. The notable paper read at the New York Conference of the Christian Socialist Fellowship. Large four-page leaflet. 10c per dozen, 50c per hundred, $2.50 per thousand. Every comrade should circulate this leaflet among all near-by ministers and church members. Be sure to read it.

What Socialists Can Do in Municipal Councils, by Rev. Carl D. Thompson, member Wisconsin Legislature, and **Love, Hate and the Class-Conscious Struggle**, by Prof. Thomas C. Hall of the Union Theological Seminary, New York. This leaflet, containing these two striking articles, is one of the very best out. Clears up many difficulties about Socialism that exist in the minds of thoughtful people. 10c per dozen, 50c per hundred, $2.50 per thousand.

Frances E. Willard's Endorsement of Socialism. An interesting and impressive collection of the great temperance leader's utterances in favor of Socialism. Every minister and other Church, Sunday-school or Temperance worker should have a copy.

24 pages; 5c each, 50c per dozen, $3.00 per hundred.

A **Christian View of Socialism,** by George H. Strobell. 30 pages. One of the clearest and best booklets ever produced on the subject of Christianity and Socialism. Shows that the Socialist doctrine of "economic determinism" is but another name for the "determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God." 5c each, 50c per dozen.

The Socialism of Jesus, by Rufus W. Weeks. A scholarly and helpful exposition of the social message of Jesus. One of the best booklets to loan or give to religious people. 45 pages; 10c each, five for 30c, twelve for 60c.

The Religion of Labor and other essays, by Rev. Harvey Dee Brown, Ph. D. Besides the exquisite essay on The Religion of Labor, this rare pamphlet contains a striking article on The Seal of Poverty and two excellent essays on Spiritual Elements in the Socialist Movement. 30 pages; 10c each, five for 30c, twelve for 60c.

Merrie England, Robert Blatchford's most famous book. Has had the largest sale of any Socialist work. 10c.

What's So and What Isn't, by John M. Work, answers many objections to Socialism in a vigorous, snappy way. Considered by many the most effective piece of propaganda for the price. 10c.

Men and Mules, by Prof. W. F. Ries. Sixty-three pertinent questions about Socialism answered in sixy-three pages in a spontaneous and striking style. More than a million copies sold. Excellent

to break the ice with. 10c each, 60c per dozen, fifty copies for $2.00.

Constructive Program of Socialism, by Rev. Carl D. Thompson, Socialist member of the Wisconsin Legislature. A much needed book. Shows what Socialists are doing and can do in city councils, legislatures and parliaments. Only 15c. Get one, sure.

Moyer's Songs of Socialism. 128 pages, with music. Songs new and old. By all odds the best Socialist song book in the English language. 25c, five for $1.00.

The Captive City of God, by Richard Heath. Printed in London, England. Shows how the church is ruined by Mammon. Through the benevolence of a friend we are able to furnish these remarkable books for 25c each.

The Golden Rule Republic—No Utopia, by Rev. William H. Randall. 180 pages of effective propaganda matter. Answers a hundred questions about how Socialism will work. Get one to read and loan. Get some to sell or give away. 25c each, five for $1.00.

"Maud Muller's Ministry," by Rev. James L. Smiley. A sweet, well-written story of how Maud Muller did marry the Judge after all, and how they suffered persecution and worked together for Socialism. Well worth the money. Paper, 25c.

Poverty, by Robert Hunter. Price, paper, 25c; cloth, $1.25. Everyone should read this great and awful book, in which the actual condition of the American people is clearly revealed. No one can

talk on economics intelligently without these facts and figures.

Principles of Scientific Socialism, by Rev. Charles H. Vail. So clear, instructive, convincing that many declare it the most useful Socialist book for the price. Paper, 35c; cloth, $1.00. Modern Socialism, by the same author, 25c.

They Must, or God and the Social Democracy, by Rev. Hermann Kutter, Zurich. American Translation edited by Rufus W. Weeks. The most startling, thrilling, instructive and inspiring contribution to the literature of Christian Socialism—truly the voice of a prophet of God. Get a copy for your friend. Bargain price, $1.00. Special terms to agents.

The Man with the Hoe and Other Poems, by Edwin Markham. Price, $1.00.

Lincoln and Other Poems, by Edwin Markham. Price, $1.00.

Rebels of the New South, by Walter Marion Raymond. Price, $1.00. The most beautiful, delightful, pure and wholesome Socialist novel printed.

The Recording Angel, by Edwin Arnold Brenholtz. Price, $1.00. A story of mystery, love and revolution. The action is rapid, intense; the interest thrilling; the purpose noble, sweet and strong.

Christianity and the Social Crisis, by Prof. Walter Rauschenbusch. The latest and best American book on Christian Socialism. $1.60.

Socialists at Work, by Robert Hunter. The result of two years' personal study of Socialism in various countries of Europe. One of the most time-

ly and vital contributions to American literature. Everyone interested in Socialism should have a copy. Cloth, $1.60.

The Belle Islers, by Richard Brinsley Newman. A novel of rare wit, satire, wisdom and force. Supposed to be written of the inhabitants of a small town by the fifteen-year-old son of the minister. It is a rich portrayal of the world in miniature under capitalism, showing how business, politics, religion and social life are affected. You will enjoy its keen shafts, its boyish freshness and originality. $1.60.

The Uprising of the Many, by Charles Edward Russel. The most comprehensive and interesting account of co-operation, public ownership, political reform and industrial progress in all nations of the world we have yet seen. Of incalculable value. 32 pages of photographs. $1.60.

The Struggle for Existence, by W. T. Mills. The greatest American work on Scientific Socialism. $2.00.

Capital, by Karl Marx. Revised edition, translated by Ernest Untermann. The economic Bible of Socialism. No one is well-read in economy who has not read Marx. Price, $2.00.

The Ancient Lowly, by C. Osborne Ward. An exhaustive, instructive study of the workers from before the time of Moses. Gives the real cause and meaning of the Exodus, explains the communism of Jesus and the apostolic church and traces the pathetic, terrible, heroic labor struggle through ancient Greece and Rome. Throws astonishing light

on the early Christian movement. Every student, especially every minister, should have it. A monumental work entirely unapproached. Two large volumes, $2.00 each.

Russia's Message, by English Walling. The heart-cry of a great people in birth-agony—the voice of the awakening world. 475 large pages, 50 pages of illustrations. The greatest contribution to recent Socialist literature. $3.00.

Order all Socialist Books of the **Christian Socialist,** 5623 Drexel Ave., Chicago.

University of California
SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
405 Hilgard Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90024-1388
Return this material to the library
from which it was borrowed.

QL OCT 18 1999

REC'D LD-URL

OCT 14 1999

Form L9-

3 1158 00479 4367

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
AA 000 391 921 4

Univers
Sout
Lib